

Evaluation of the  
Food Stamp Employment  
and Training Program

# Report to Congress on Program Implementation

Prepared by:

**Abt Associates Inc.**

Michael Puma

Alan Werner

Marie Hojnacki

Prepared for:

Food and Nutrition Service  
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Submitted to:

Committee on Agriculture,  
Nutrition and Forestry  
U.S. Senate

Committee on Agriculture  
U.S. House of Representatives

December 16, 1988

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to a number of individuals who contributed to this report. We would first like to thank Boyd Kowal, of the Office of Analysis and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) who, as Project Officer, continues to provide overall guidance for this study. In addition, Ellen Henigan, Art Foley, and Mark Johnston, also of FNS, have reviewed various aspects of this project and provided considerable assistance. Marie Hojnacki, Cathy Casserly, Gary Silverstein, Marjorie Levin, Ellen Emerson and Christopher Jones interviewed State and local program staff as part of implementing random assignment procedures in the selected local food stamp offices. Ed Bryant and Jim Bethel of Westat developed the sampling plan, and responded to numerous requests for help with statistical weighting. Ellie Lee, Joanne Tighe and Kristin Snow helped compile the data; Mark Moss, Christopher Jones and Gary Silverstein contributed written sections. Eileen Fahey and Marsha Strother prepared the manuscript. Andrew Robertson prepared the exhibits.

Finally, the authors would like to express our appreciation to our colleagues, Larry Orr, Jean Wood and Chris Hamilton for their review of this report.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	i
GLOSSARY .....	vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	vii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
A. HISTORY OF WORK REQUIREMENTS IN THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM .....	1
B. EVIDENCE FROM PAST RESEARCH .....	5
C. THE NEW FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM .....	7
Operational Characteristics .....	7
Technical Assistance .....	11
D. THE EVALUATION STUDY .....	11
Overview .....	11
Study Components .....	13
Current Status .....	16
Contents of this Report .....	16
II. E&T PROGRAM DESIGN AND SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEMS ...	17
Introduction .....	17
A. E&T PROGRAM SERVICES .....	18
Types of E&T Program Services .....	18
Service Configurations .....	20
Geographic Coverage .....	20
Change from Previous Job Search Programs .....	23
B. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT SERVICES .....	23
Type of Reimbursement Method .....	23
Provision of In-kind Support Services .....	25
C. THE E&T PROGRAM SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM .....	25
Linkages with Other Service Providers .....	25
Assignment of Administrative Responsibility .....	28

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
D. PARTICIPANT EXEMPTIONS AND PROGRAM TARGETING .....	29
E. FY1988 E&T PROGRAM FUNDING AND SPENDING .....	34
Planned E&T Program Funding Levels .....	34
F. PLANNED E&T PROGRAM CHANGES FOR FY1989 .....	37
Planned E&T Program Changes in Participation Levels .....	37
Planned Changes in Services for FY1989 .....	37
G. SUMMARY .....	39
III. E&T PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS .....	41
Determination of Work Registration Status and Service Referral .....	41
Participant Screening and Service Assignment .....	41
Participant Monitoring .....	44
Determination of Noncompliance .....	46
Summary .....	47
IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS .....	49
A. E&T PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS .....	49
Demographic Characteristics .....	49
Household Size and Composition .....	51
Multiple E&T Participants .....	51
Household Income .....	53
Educational Background .....	53
Labor Market Experiences .....	56
Participation by Volunteers .....	56
B. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN E&T PROGRAM SERVICES AND PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS .....	57
Demographic Characteristics .....	57
Income .....	57
Education and Labor Market Experiences .....	58
C. SUMMARY .....	58
APPENDIX A: REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON WORK PROGRAMS FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS .....	A1
APPENDIX B: DETAILED STATISTICAL TABLES .....	B1

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

	<u>Page</u>
EXHIBIT I.1      Chronology of Food Stamp Work Requirement .....	2
EXHIBIT I.2      E&T Program Participants .....	10
EXHIBIT I.3      Research Objectives of the Evaluation of the E&T Program .....	12
EXHIBIT II.1     E&T Program Services Planned by the States, FY1988 .....	19
EXHIBIT II.2     Percent of Local FSAs Implementing E&T Program Service Models, and Percent of Total Participants Covered, FY1988 .....	21
EXHIBIT II.3     Percent of Counties with E&T Program in FY1988 Compared with Percent of Counties with Job Search Program in FY1986 .....	22
EXHIBIT II.4     Comparison of New E&T Program to Previously Existing Food Stamp Job Search Program .....	24
EXHIBIT II.5     Local FSA Integration and Coordination of the E&T Program with Other Agencies and Programs, FY1988 .....	27
EXHIBIT II.6     Administrative Responsibility for the Provision of E&T Program Services, FY1988 .....	30
EXHIBIT II.7     State Exemptions and Targeting Policy for Mandatory Work Registrants, FY1988 .....	32
EXHIBIT II.8     E&T Program Participation Resulting from Exemption and Targeting Policies, FY1988 .....	33
EXHIBIT II.9     State Planned Cost per E&T Participant by Service Model, FY1988 .....	35
EXHIBIT II.10    Change in Planned E&T Program Service Components, FY1988 vs. FY1989 .....	38
EXHIBIT III.1    General Model of E&T Process .....	42
EXHIBIT III.2    Method of Program Screening and Service Assignment in the E&T Program, FY1988 .....	45

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

	<u>Page</u>
EXHIBIT IV.1 Demographic Characteristics of E&T Program Participants at Application/Recertification, FY1988 .....	50
EXHIBIT IV.2 Size and Composition of E&T Participant Households at Time of Application/Recertification, FY 1988 .....	52
EXHIBIT IV.3 Income of E&T Participant Households, at Time of Application/Recertification, FY1988 .....	54
EXHIBIT IV.4 Educational Background and Labor Market Experience of E&T Participants at Time of Application/ Recertification, FY1988 .....	55

## GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT

AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Program
DOL	Department of Labor
E&T	Food Stamp Employment and Training Program
FNS	Food and Nutrition Service
FSA	Food Stamp Agency
GA	General Assistance
GAO	U.S. General Accounting Office
GED	General Educational Development certificate
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act
NPA	Non-Public Assistance
OMB	U.S. Office of Management and Budget
PA	Public Assistance
SESA	State Employment Service Agency
SIPP	Survey of Income and Program Participation
UI	Unemployment Insurance Program
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
WIN	Work Incentive Program
YMCA	Young Men's Christian Association

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### A. INTRODUCTION

#### Purpose of this Report

This is an interim report on the Evaluation of the Food Stamp Employment and Training (E&T) Program. It is descriptive in nature, and focuses on the way that States have implemented the E&T Program and the characteristics of the participants being served. A report on the impact of the Program on participants' employment, earnings and receipt of welfare will be submitted by early 1990. This second report will also provide information on the costs of operating the E&T Program, and an assessment of the extent to which any realized benefits exceed these expenditures.

#### Description of the E&T Program

On April 1, 1987, all States were required by the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198; Section 1517) to implement the E&T Program to provide employment and training services for certain able-bodied nonexempt food stamp recipients, and selected volunteers. Within the general framework of the authorizing legislation, States were given the flexibility to design and operate the E&T Program in a manner best suited to their unique situations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. In particular, States were given discretion in the following areas: the range of services available to Program participants including the designation of some components as mandatory and others as voluntary; the designation of those who must (or may) participate in the program; and, the level of funding above a basic Federal grant.

#### Background and Context

The E&T Program does not represent the first time that work requirements have been imposed on food stamp recipients. Since 1971, shortly after the Food Stamp Program (FSP) became a national source of assistance to low-income households, able-bodied recipients have been required to accept suitable jobs. In subsequent years, FSP work policy has undergone various modifications designed both to strengthen the requirements and target those most employable.

These changes have not, however, occurred in a vacuum. First, over the last 20 years there has accumulated substantial evidence to indicate that employment and training programs are both feasible to implement, and able to achieve modest but significant increases in participants' employment and earnings and decreases in public assistance. With respect to the FSP, the Job Search Demonstrations conducted in the early 1980s provided especially positive results in these areas.

Second, public assistance is intended to provide help for only relatively brief intervals that end when the recipient is securely established in a job (except those too old or infirm to work). As

## B. FINDINGS

### How does the E&T Program Work?

Although exact operations vary a great deal, at a general level the process used to serve individual participants can be viewed as consisting of five components. First, eligibility workers determine which, if any, individuals applying for (or being recertified for) food stamp benefits are required to register for work and accept suitable employment if it is offered. These work registrants are then referred to a separate employment and training office to receive services -- in all but the 10 percent of local Food Stamp Agencies (FSAs) that serve applicants, this next step takes place after the individuals are determined eligible for food stamp benefits.


At the employment and training unit, work registrants are next screened for possible exemption from E&T requirements (i.e., those facing difficulties related to child care, transportation or health conditions). Once determined to be a nonexempt E&T participant (a subset of the work registrants), individuals are assigned to a service component such as job search, job search training, educational classes, or work experience. In most local FSAs, this step is relatively straightforward because only one service is being offered -- often job search. Where alternatives are available, about three-quarters of local FSAs use some sort of caseworker assessment to determine the most appropriate service component; more than half allow participants an opportunity to choose among a menu of available options after the assessment is completed.

During the period of participation in the E&T Program, local FSAs generally monitor the progress being made by the participant. How this is done varies by the type of service to which the individual is assigned. Job search and job search training services generally specify some type of regularly scheduled monitoring visit to meet with an assigned employment and training caseworker. In more intensive services (e.g., educational components) participants are often required to submit documentation of completion of their assigned activity (e.g., attaining a General Educational Development certificate).

The final step in this general process is related to noncompliance with the E&T requirements (e.g., failure to attend classes or make the required number of employee contacts). Although participants are subject to loss of benefits if they fail to comply, participants are also allowed to "cure" their noncompliance by reporting to their caseworker and agreeing to cooperate.

### What types of Training are Provided?

One of the most striking aspects of the E&T Program is the variety of services being provided, and the numerous arrangements State and local FSAs have made to assist participants. While job search is the most commonly available service component (offered by almost every State), more intensive services such as adult basic education (e.g., high school equivalency courses, literacy training), vocational training, work experience and workfare are also widely available.



Moreover, E&T services are being provided by many different sources, including traditional employment service agencies (State Employment Service Agencies, Job Training Partnership Act programs), local school districts, community colleges, and public and private community-based organizations (e.g., Goodwill, Young Men's Christian Association). These linkages with existing service providers are intended to allow the E&T Program to leverage additional resources, achieve certain economies of scale through more efficient operations, and avoid having to "reinvent the wheel" in order to assist food stamp recipients. The availability of such networking arrangements has enabled the E&T Program to provide a variety of services in FY1988.

It also appears that the Program is evolving over time. Comparing State E&T Program plans for FY1988 and FY1989 reveals that States are adding and deleting service components. Rather than adopting rigid approaches to meet Federal requirements, States appear quite willing to experiment with new service components. Again, this is an encouraging outcome -- Congress allowed States an opportunity to try different ways to assist low-income persons obtain gainful employment, and States appear willing to seek alternative ways to achieve this goal.


What other  
Services are  
being Provided?

State and local FSAs have recognized the needs of individual participants, and have taken steps to help them complete their education and training assignments. Where financial burdens can be a barrier (e.g., the cost of travel to attend classes or to a worksite), States have made an effort to be flexible in deciding how to reimburse participants for their out-of-pocket expenses. Many States, especially those offering more intensive services, have opted to pay actual expenses rather than provide a fixed reimbursement amount. In addition to cash subsidies, many local FSAs have also provided various types of in-kind services such as child care arrangements, transportation assistance and counseling services.

**Did E&T Expand  
Existing  
Job Search  
Programs?**

In light of the limited time allowed to plan and implement the E&T Program, States might have been expected to avoid creating new services for food stamp recipients. Many States had existing job search programs in place, and because this is an allowable component under E&T, the simple response would have been to continue the previous services. But, as noted above, States have, in fact, implemented a variety of different types of training services. About three-quarters of all local FSAs were operating programs in FY1988 that were either entirely new or differed markedly from previous job search programs.

Percent of Local FSAs




**Is the E&T  
Program  
Available  
Nationwide?**

Although all States implemented an E&T Program in FY1988, only 18 States had planned statewide implementation; an additional 12 States planned to make the Program available in more than 50 percent of their counties. Such geographic exemptions are permitted by the 1985 Act if it would be impractical to operate the Program in certain localities because of remoteness or poor labor market conditions.

This level of coverage, however, represents a significant expansion from previous FSP work programs. In 42 States, E&T Program coverage in FY1988 represented an increase over that available under the previous job search program.

How many  
Food Stamp  
Recipients  
did States  
Plan to Serve  
in E&T?

In addition to geographic exemptions, States can exempt certain individuals for a variety of impediments such as a lack of child care or transportation and temporary health problems. States have made considerable use of these exemptions, particularly, as noted above, geographic area exclusions. Their plans called for E&T participation of about 1.6 million individuals in FY1988 -- about half of the total 3.3 million eligible work registrants. In addition, States planned to include about 90,000 volunteers (about 6% of all E&T participants were expected to be volunteers). As planned, the E&T Program is more than twice the combined size of all of the AFDC work programs (in 1985 AFDC programs served about 700,000 individuals).



\* Estimated total number of food stamp recipients participating in a year. This is computed by multiplying the average monthly participation of 18.68 million by the average rate of caseload turnover of 1.7, i.e., total annual participation equals 1.7 times the average monthly caseload.

What Was the  
Planned Cost of  
Operating the  
E&T Program?

There are three types of Federal financial support provided to States for the operation of the E&T Program: a 100 percent grant based on the relative size of each State's FSP caseload; a 50 percent match of additional Program costs; and, a 50 percent match of participant reimbursements up to a maximum of \$25 per person per month. Although full information on operating costs will not be available until the completion of the evaluation study, data are available on total Federal and State budgeted expenses. In FY1988, the planned cost of the E&T Program was about \$224 million -- \$60 million for the 100 percent grants, \$100 million for additional service expenses, and \$64 million for participant reimbursements.

**How do Costs  
Vary by Type  
of Service?**

For the purposes of this evaluation, States were categorized into one of three Program models: Job Search States which primarily offer job search services to E&T participants; Job Search Training States offering additional job search assistance such as job finding clubs and training in employment techniques; and Intensive Service States that provide more in-depth remediation such as basic education, skills training and work experience. This grouping is a convenient analytical tool, but it is not perfect. Although States have been classified on the basis of their most prevalent type of service component, there is a great deal of variety in E&T Program services. Even within programs classified as a Job Search model, other types of services may be offered.

Notwithstanding these limitations, an examination of State funding plans indicates, as expected, that the cost per participant is related to the intensity of services offered. That is, planned costs per participant are highest for Intensive Service States at \$210 per participant, and those categorized as Job Search States are the lowest at \$58 per participant.

	Model 1: Job Search	Model 2: Job Search Training	Model 3: Intensive Services
Service cost per participant	\$33	\$90	\$155
Average participant reimbursement	\$25	\$27	\$55
Total cost per participant	\$58	\$118	\$210

It is difficult at this time to draw any firm conclusions from these figures. First, these data represent planned costs and participation; information on actual expenditures and participation levels are not now available. Second, within a Program model category, the average per participant costs exhibit wide variation. In many instances, more intense (and presumably more costly) programs appear to be less expensive than simpler job search programs, and vice versa. This can be the result of a number of factors including differences in the way similarly titled services are actually delivered and the extent to which States have been able to forge linkages with other State agencies and programs. The evaluation study currently underway will address many of these questions, but results will not be available until early 1990.

**How do Planned  
Program Costs  
Compare to  
Actual  
Expenditures?**

An examination of actual Federal E&T expenditures for FY1988 (State expenditure information is not reported to FNS), show a shortfall of approximately 30 percent below planned costs. Actual Federal expenditures for FY1988 totalled \$98.7 million, compared to budgeted costs of \$138.5 million.

Based on information for the first three quarters of FY1988, it is expected that Program participation will also be less than planned. Instead of planned participation of about 1.6 million individuals, it appears that States will probably serve about one million persons -- a similar shortfall of about 37 percent. While it is again difficult to draw any firm conclusions from these data, it seems that the lower than expected Program cost is a result of lower than predicted participation levels.

**Why is Actual  
Participation  
Lower than  
Planned?**


The participation shortfall noted above should not be construed to be a failure of the E&T Program. Rather, States appear to have initially overestimated the number of recipients who would be subject to the work registration requirements and not exempted from E&T participation. Given the short planning period afforded State FSAs and the lack of information on which to base these estimates, it is not too surprising that States' estimates proved to be inaccurate.

For FY1989, States have planned to serve substantially more participants than in FY1988 -- 1.4 million compared to one million in FY1988. For example, a majority of States (all but 6) have planned to expand the availability of the E&T Program to more areas of their respective States in FY1989. In fact, the number of States planning complete statewide coverage will increase from 18 in FY1988 to 26 in FY1989.


**What Type of  
Individuals are  
Participating  
in the E&T  
Program**

The flexibility afforded States has resulted in the targeting of the E&T Program toward certain types of food stamp recipients:


- Most participants are relatively young (the average age is 33 years) and equally likely to be male or female.
- For the most part, E&T participants are single and unmarried. Slightly more than half of all participants have never been married and live alone.
- About 6 out of every 10 E&T participants are minorities.
- E&T participants are generally poorly educated -- only about half have completed high school -- but about one-third have obtained supplementary technical or vocational training.




Age



Household Size




Marital Status




Ethnicity

- E&T participants are also not well attached to the labor market -- only about 4 out of 10 were gainfully employed during the past year. Of those who were employed, about half worked more than six months, and about one-third worked from 9-12 months. Average employment consisted of about 30 hours per week for an average of \$5.59 per hour, or only about \$168 per week.
- E&T participants in local Job Search model FSAs are most likely to be White married males residing in households with earned income. Because job search is intended to assist those most employable to find productive jobs, this finding appears to support a conclusion that the Program is being correctly targeted. But, until information is available on the actual services received (recall that FSAs in the other two categories also provide job search services), this conclusion must remain tentative.

#### EDUCATION



#### LABOR MARKET EXPERIENCE



- E&T participants in local Job Search Training model FSAs are most likely to be Black single female General Assistance (GA) recipients.
- E&T participants in local Intensive Service model FSAs are most likely to be Black single females or female household-heads -- these individuals are also likely to be receiving GA but are most likely to be recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

In general, the E&T Program is serving food stamp recipients who are young, unmarried and non-White. These individuals, however, are in need of remedial services to compete in today's labor market. They typically lack formal education, and have been unable to maintain steady employment in the past.

States appear to have focused the E&T Program on those work registrants who are also GA recipients -- about 40 percent of all E&T participants receive GA benefits. Moreover, this representation is higher than the proportion of all work registrants who receive such assistance. This finding may be the result of two factors. First, unlike AFDC recipients GA recipients involved in another work program are not categorically exempted from E&T participation. Second, there is a clear incentive for States to provide job services to their GA population through the E&T Program. If the Program is successful in helping participants find employment, States can realize significant savings in welfare expenditures as these individuals become self-sufficient.

It is also notable that relatively few AFDC recipients are participating in the E&T Program. Only about 6 percent of the E&T participants receive AFDC benefits; and those who do are primarily in local Intensive Service model FSAs. The relatively low representation is due to the fact that AFDC recipients involved in Title IV work programs (i.e., WIN) are exempt from the E&T requirements. Those AFDC recipients who have been assigned to E&T may be individuals not covered under an existing WIN program. For example, the State may only provide services to AFDC households with both parents present. In such instances, the E&T Program may provide an opportunity for States to extend employment and training services to a portion of their AFDC caseload who have otherwise been excluded from such assistance. This also may account for the concentration of these participants in Intensive Service model FSAs (i.e., E&T may have been integrated with a pre-existing work program).

### The Forth-coming Evaluation Report

This interim report provides substantial information about the implementation of the E&T Program. First, a large number of food stamp recipients will have participated in the Program in FY1988 (about one million) -- the Program's first full year of operation. Second, although job search is the most commonly available service, these participants appear to have at least the opportunity to receive additional forms of assistance such as job skills training, educational services and work experience. Third, the services being provided typically represent new initiatives and are generally being delivered using linkages to various types of external agencies and/or programs.

What is not known, however, is the degree to which the Program is cost effective, i.e., do the services increase employment and decrease welfare dependency and at what cost. The evaluation study currently underway will address these and other relevant questions. Results will be available to Congress in early 1990.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Congress, as part of the Food Security Act of 1985 (P.L. 99-198), required that all States implement an Employment and Training (E&T) Program for certain food stamp recipients by April 1, 1987. This requirement, which replaced food stamp job search as the major work-related activity of the Food Stamp Program (FSP), was intended to help able-bodied recipients obtain paid employment and decrease their dependence on public assistance programs. A major emphasis of this legislation was that States be given maximum flexibility in designing programs that best fit their individual needs. The role of the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), which administers the FSP, is to approve State plans for the E&T Program and to monitor performance to ensure that each State provides a meaningful opportunity for its food stamp recipients to increase their employment prospects.

In addition to authorizing the E&T Program, Congress also mandated an evaluation of the Program. Abt Associates Inc., and its subcontractor, Westat, were selected by FNS to conduct this comprehensive evaluation to determine the effect of the E&T Program on the employment, earnings, and welfare income of participating food stamp recipients and applicants. This is an interim report from the evaluation study. It is descriptive in nature and focuses on the way in which States have implemented the E&T Program and the characteristics of the participants. The results of the complete impact evaluation will be available to Congress by early 1990.

### **A. HISTORY OF WORK REQUIREMENTS IN THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM**

The E&T Program does not represent the first time that work requirements have been imposed on food stamp recipients. In fact, as shown in Exhibit I.1, the requirement that able-bodied recipients accept suitable jobs\* as a condition for receiving benefits has been a standard requirement of the FSP since 1971, shortly after it became a national Program. This initial requirement covered all able-bodied adults, ages 18 to 65, except household members caring for dependent children under 18 or incapacitated adults, students enrolled at least half time in school or training programs, and persons working at least 30 hours per week. Nonexempt recipients had to comply with the requirements or face the penalty of having their entire household removed from the food stamp rolls.

---

\* Employment was defined as unsuitable if wages were below Federal or State minimums, if union membership or nonmembership was a condition of employment, if the work was offered at the site of a strike or lockout, if the employment was not within a reasonable distance of the individual's residence, or if the employment was not within the individual's major field of experience (unless, after a reasonable period of time, such work was clearly unavailable).

## Exhibit I.1

### CHRONOLOGY OF FOOD STAMP WORK REQUIREMENT

#### YEAR

1974 First Work Registration Requirement (P.L. 93-671). Able-bodied food

stamp recipients between ages 18 and 65 must register for work and actively seek employment (report for job interviews and accept suitable work) as a condition of receipt of food stamp benefits. Exceptions to this requirement include: (1) those caring for dependent children under age 18 or incapacitated adults, (2) students, or (3) those working at least 30 hours per week.

1977 Exemptions Changed and Sanctions Specified (P.L. 95-113). Recipients from age 18 to 59 are required to work register. Dependent care exemption changed to child under age 12. Changed definition of suitable work to include jobs outside of major field of experience. States authorized to sanction entire households when individual work registrants are found to be noncompliant, and to extend the disqualification for two months.

1981 Requirements Strengthened (P.L. 97-98). Disqualifies work registrant who voluntarily quits a job. Annualizes work registration requirement.

1982 Initiation of Job Search Contracts. FNS contracts with State Food Stamp Agencies for job search services.

1983 Exemptions Changed and Optional Applicant Job Search Added (P.L. 98-204). Changed exemption for dependent child care to children under age 6. Provides States with option of requiring job search at application. Disqualifies those who voluntarily quit a job without good cause from 60 to 90 days. USDA no longer required to issue work registration rules jointly with the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). FSP work rules no longer required to conform with those issued under the Work Incentive Program (WIN) for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

1985 Congress Initiates E&T Programs (P.L. 99-198). States must establish Food Stamp Employment and Training Programs.

1987 Implementation of E&T. States commence operation of E&T Program

Subsequent legislative and regulatory changes modified this initial work requirement in two general ways. First, exemptions were expanded to target those most able to find employment -- individuals over age 59 were exempted and provision was made to exempt others for various types of health or language problems or those residing in remote areas. Second, the work requirements were strengthened in a number of important ways:

- dependent care exemptions were limited to individuals caring for children under age six;
- mandatory work registrants were required to contact up to 24 prospective employers during an eight week period;
- work registrants failing to comply with these requirements caused their entire household to lose food stamp benefits for a period of two months; and
- the definition of suitable employment was changed to cover a wider range of jobs -- individuals had to accept jobs outside their major field of experience.

The context within which these legislative and regulatory actions were taking place was full of contradictions. On one hand, there was research evidence suggesting that some types of interventions, such as job-finding clubs, might actually increase the employment of recipients (this is discussed in the following section). On the other hand, several studies, including one conducted in 1978 by the General Accounting Office (GAO)\*, had indicated that FSP work requirements, and those in other welfare programs, had been ineffective. As a consequence, from 1979 to 1983 two demonstration studies were conducted to test alternative work strategies.

The first, mandated by Congress in the 1979 Food Stamp Act, evaluated the use of "workfare" in which food stamp recipients were required to perform work in exchange for their benefits. These pilot projects, initiated in 14 sites in 1979, consisted of three elements: an initial period of job search for 30 days; a period of public service work in exchange for benefits; and the continued search for unsubsidized jobs. Because of certain methodological problems, however, these demonstration projects did not produce conclusive evidence.

The second initiative was the Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration begun in 1979 at the request of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Involving approximately 44,000 food stamp applicants and recipients at 18 different sites, the demonstration took place in two stages. The initial stage, from October 1981 to March 1983, involved 11 sites and four alternative job search

---

\* U.S. General Accounting Office. Food Stamp Work Requirements -- Ineffective Paperwork or Effective Tool? Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General, April 1978.

models -- in-person registration for work at the State Employment Security Agency (SESA), a "job club" to help individuals find employment, a combination of in-person work registration and a job club, and job search run by the local Food Stamp Agency (FSA).

Initially, this demonstration project was operated jointly by the Departments of Agriculture and Labor (DOL). During the early stages, however, DOL withdrew from its administrative role (i.e., operating the SESA programs) leaving USDA to contract directly with State FSAs for job services (State FSAs then subcontracted with the SESAs). As a result, USDA decided to further test the capacity of local FSAs to administer the work requirements themselves. The demonstration was expanded to test four additional approaches, all administered by FSAs, in seven additional sites -- requiring applicants to make a specified number of job contacts prior to certification, job skills training combined with eight weeks of job search, job clubs, and job clubs combined with workfare.

An evaluation of the various demonstration projects\*, reported a number of key findings:

- FSAs were able to successfully implement the various employment and training models with only few deviations. It was determined, however, that implementation would be improved if States were given the flexibility to tailor their work registration and job search requirements and procedures to their individual labor markets, caseloads, and client characteristics.
- All the models increased the employment and earnings of participants and reduced food stamp payments; for all but one model, benefits exceeded operating costs.
- By placing greater emphasis on the speed and rigor with which work registrants were identified, entered into job search, and sanctioned for noncompliance, FSAs could achieve significant participant effects and cost savings.

By 1986, 38 States, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands operated FSP job search programs, although these services were available statewide in only 9 States. In addition to job search training, some States offered other services, including on-the-job-training, classroom-based vocational education, and workfare programs.

---

\* Brandeis University, The Center for Human Resources, and Abt Associates Inc., Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration. Final Report prepared for U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 1986.

## B. EVIDENCE FROM PAST RESEARCH

Over the past twenty years, a number of changes in the structure of income maintenance programs, and in the work and training opportunities and requirements facing welfare recipients, have been proposed and tested. With the exception of the Negative Income Tax Experiments of the late 1960s and 1970s, most of these demonstration projects have not examined radically new income support programs. Instead, these project have experimented with ways of promoting financial independence through employment and training services, and the obligation to search for and accept employment where available.

The assumption underlying these various initiatives is that public assistance should provide support for a relatively brief interval that ends when the recipient is securely established in employment (except for people too old or infirm to be expected to work). Moreover, it is assumed that public assistance should facilitate and motivate this outcome, making the assistance interval as brief as possible.

A review of the evidence from these past research efforts suggests eight major conclusions:

- Effects are Likely to be Small. Previous research suggests that, while it is possible to design and operate employment and training programs that have positive impacts on participants' employment, earnings and welfare benefits, the size of the effect is likely to be relatively small.
- Effects Vary Over Time. Prior research also suggests that the impact expected from employment and training programs display trends over time. Usually, the impacts are found to take some time to appear, depending on the timing of the intervention, and often decrease over time.
- There is a Relationship Among Impacts. These appears to be a complex relationship between program impacts on employment and earnings and program impacts on the incidence and amount of public benefits received. Because of both administrative rules and individual behavior, increases in earnings do not always lead to comparable decreases in the receipt of public assistance.
- Participation Rates are Generally Low. An important indication of the effectiveness of an employment and training program is the degree to which targeted individuals participate. Prior research has shown that even in instances where participation was mandatory, and program resources were generous, participation rates rarely exceed 50 percent of the target population.

---

\* A detailed summary of the literature related to employment and training programs for welfare recipients can be found in Appendix A.

- Attracting Volunteers is Difficult. Prior research has also shown that the penetration rate of a voluntary employment and training program is often low. Although the use of outreach, marketing and enhanced services can significantly increase the number of volunteers joining the program, overall participation rates are generally low.
- Enforcement of the Obligation to Participate is Often Unsuccessful. Because mandatory participants in employment and training programs are subject to sanctions for failure to comply with program rules, one would expect that if participation rates are low, sanctioning rates would be relatively high. Most prior research on the enforcement of such requirements, however, suggests that this is rarely the case. For a variety of reasons, mandatory participants appear to be able to escape both participation and sanctioning.
- To Be Successful, Programs Must Provide for the Efficient Coordination of Services and Information. Prior research has generally found that the implementation of a new employment and training program can be fraught with pitfalls that threaten to undermine the success of the program and its intended policy ends. Such arrangements can be difficult to develop and maintain. First, coordination of services, and the management of program information are difficult and complicated tasks for a welfare department to perform. In many instances, the delivery of employment and training services is new to income maintenance agency personnel. Second, the implementation of an employment and training program often requires interaction with other public agencies and institutions. A program may therefore fail to have its intended social impact, therefore, not because it is faulty in design, but because it is not delivering the necessary services.
- Participant Costs Vary Substantially. Prior demonstration projects have reported widely varying per participant costs. In large part, this variation is tied to the intensity and duration of the services provided. For example, the cost of job search and job club programs have been relatively modest, usually no more than \$100 per participant. On the other hand, subsidized employment, even when partly funded by grant diversion, has been relatively costly ranging from \$600 to \$1200 per participant.

The important lesson from the work-welfare research is that employment and training programs can be implemented and that they are likely to produce positive but small effects. Moreover, although the effects are generally small, their magnitude is often found to exceed the cost of providing services to recipients of public assistance.

## C. THE NEW FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM

The creation of the new Food Stamp E&T Program was influenced by two related factors. On the one hand, as noted above considerable evidence had accumulated showing that work programs for recipients of public assistance were both practical to implement and generally cost effective. In particular, Congress was encouraged by the success of the Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration projects. On the other hand, there was growing concern about the effectiveness of current income maintenance programs, particularly, as some critics have claimed, their tendency to produce long-term dependency. The E&T Program is part of a broad national movement to improve the welfare system, most notably seen in recent welfare reforms and the proliferation of State-initiated demonstration projects.

### Operational Characteristics

The Food Security Act of 1985, which created the E&T Program, replaced the former optional job search provisions with the new requirement that all States conduct employment and training programs. Individuals not specifically exempted by law, however, were still required to register for work.

Under the 1985 Act, States were given the flexibility to design and operate the E&T Program in a manner best suited to their unique situations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. In particular, States were given discretion in the following areas: the range of services available to Program participants, including the designation of some components as mandatory and others as voluntary; the designation of those who must (or may) participate in the Program; and the funding level above a basic Federal grant. Each of these areas of State discretion is reviewed below.

Service Components. The principal intent of Congress in creating the E&T Program was to assist food stamp recipients to gain the skills, training, or work experience needed to increase their ability to obtain regular employment. To meet this goal, current regulations allow States to offer one or more of the following components:

- Job Search, which requires participants to make a specified number of job contacts in a given time period (e.g., 24 job contacts in eight weeks) and to report those job contacts to the local FSA (most frequently at a job search monitoring visit). The participant may be required to pursue employment independently or to meet with a job counselor on a regular basis to report job search activity and develop new leads for potential job openings. Whatever the structure of the job search component, mandatory participants are subject to sanction (e.g., suspension of food stamp benefits for a specified time period) if they do not comply with the requirements.
- Job Search Training, in which participants are required to engage in structured learning activities regarding useful techniques for successful job-hunting. Such a program may consist of job skills

assessments, job finding clubs, training in techniques for improving employability, job placement services, or other direct training or support activities, including educational programs determined by the State agency to expand the job search abilities or employability of those subject to the Program. (Education components are allowed if they directly enhance the employability of the participants.)

Job search activity may also be required as part of the participation in training, and may occur either prior to training or immediately after its completion. Some States choose to use job search training only for those participants who appear to lack job search skills, or who have gone through a period of unsuccessful job search.

- Workfare, in which a participant works off the food stamp benefit amount at a predetermined wage rate at a public sector worksite.
- Work Experience, in which a participant is typically placed at a public sector worksite for a certain time in order to acquire both generic and specific work skills.

To the extent practical, States are also allowed under the 1985 Act to design and operate programs that are compatible with similar programs already operated within the State (such as work and training programs for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children -- AFDC). The Act also permits State FSAs to contract with other State and local employment and training agencies administering programs under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

**Program Participants.** In addition to allowing States a choice of service components for the E&T Program, the 1985 Act also provides for some flexibility in defining the food stamp recipients that must participate. That is, although the rules for work registration that were in effect before the 1985 Act are still in force, States have some discretion in defining who from the pool of work registrants will be mandatory E&T participants.

States may, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, exempt from participation entire categories of work registrants, as well as individual work registrants. For example, the 1985 Act allows States to exempt categories of food stamp work registrants on the basis of such criteria as poor local labor market conditions, or because certain groups of nonexempt registrants may require intensive services too costly to be cost-effective. The Act also provides that States may exempt from participation registrants during their first 30 days of receipt of food stamp benefits. Finally, States may exempt individual registrants for whom participation would be impractical because of personal circumstances such as the remote location of work opportunities, or the unavailability of child care.

In addition to having flexibility in the determination of mandatory participants in the E&T Program, States may also allow exempted individuals (e.g., those caring for young children) to voluntarily participate in the Program. Indeed, the law requires States to permit exempt individuals to participate on a voluntary basis "to the extent...practicable."

As shown in Exhibit I.2, the result of these various categorical and individual exemptions is a relatively small pool of food stamp recipients subjected to the E&T requirements (i.e., compared to the entire FSP population). By providing States with flexibility to design their own programs, Congress and USDA have attempted to target the E&T Program to those most likely to benefit from the opportunity to receive services.

**Funding Levels.** In order to support the E&T Program, the 1985 Act requires USDA to allocate to the States \$50 million for FY1987, \$60 million for FY1988, and \$75 million in FY1989 and FY1990. Each State's share of these funds is proportional to its respective FSP caseload and is not subject to a State matching requirement (i.e., other FSP administrative expenses are usually matched on 50/50 basis). Federal grants must be used solely for the E&T Program, and may not be diverted to other activities.

In an effort to encourage additional Program activity, the Act also provides that any State funds spent on the E&T Program in excess of the basic grant is to be matched dollar-for-dollar by USDA. There is no statutory limitation on the amount of Federal matching funds States may receive for this purpose. However, States must submit detailed budgets to FNS for approval before incurring these added expenses.


Finally, the Act requires that States must reimburse E&T Program participants for transportation and other program-related expenses up to \$25 per participant per month. USDA pays half the cost of these reimbursements with funds separate from the grants allocated for Program operation.

States are permitted to reimburse participants for expenses exceeding \$25 a month, but USDA cannot match these additional funds.

**Other Regulatory Requirements.** Although the Act allows flexibility in many areas of Program design, there are some operational constraints. In addition to the overall requirement that State plans for the E&T Program be reviewed and approved by the Secretary, USDA has in response to the legislative mandate, issued specific regulations defining requirements for Program service components and for levels of Program participation. For the first quarter of FY1989, 35 percent of mandatory participants must be placed in a service component; this requirement rises to 50 percent for the remainder FY1989 and thereafter. These standards have been set in consideration of a number of concerns:

## Exhibit I.2

### E&T Program Participants



- The goals should be reasonably attainable by States.
- The standards should not be set too high and, as a consequence, deter States from incorporating more intensive (and costly) services for those who need them.
- Yet, the standards should ensure that States provide an opportunity for a broad spectrum of food stamp recipients to benefit from the E&T Program.

The regulations also provide that FNS may adjust an individual State's performance requirements for Program components or client participation if the State can demonstrate that the service components it plans to offer, or the type and proportion of participants it plans to serve, will require a significantly higher level of effort than the minimum effort required by the FNS regulations.

#### Technical Assistance

Implementing the E&T Program was a complex undertaking involving the Federal government and State and local FSAs. To help with this process, FNS provided several mechanisms for technical assistance. First, three publications were distributed offering guidance on how to design and operate employment and training programs for food stamp recipients. Second, FNS staff provided assistance to State FSAs during their initial planning stages. This included help with the preparation of State plans, and regional training meetings to which State staff were invited to discuss the new regulations.

#### **D. THE EVALUATION STUDY**

##### Overview

The evaluation of the E&T Program will provide comprehensive information both on the implementation of the Program and on its effects. The specific objectives of the study, summarized in Exhibit I.3, are to:

- describe the employment and training services operated by the States;
- assess the Program's implementation and its effectiveness in providing employment assistance to participants;
- measure changes in food stamp recipients' employment and earnings which result from the Program; and,
- assess the costs and estimate the cost-effectiveness of the E&T Program.

The evaluation, which is national in scope, is designed primarily to meet the important informational needs of Congress and USDA. The study, however, will also help States and localities in planning future modifications of their programs, including improving services, lowering costs, and increasing the effectiveness of service components.

**Exhibit I.3**

**MAJOR RESEARCH OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION OF THE E&T PROGRAM**

**STUDY OBJECTIVES**

**Describe the E&T Program Planned  
and Operated in the States**

**Assess Implementation  
of the E&T Program**

**Measure Program  
Impacts**

**Assess Costs and Cost-  
Effectiveness of the E&T Program**

To meet these diverse needs, the evaluation is designed to be nationally representative in terms of the types of food stamp recipients that participate in the Program, the different areas of the Nation in which the Program operates, and the types of services that are provided. For analytical convenience, operating programs have been grouped into the following typology consisting of three general program types or models:

- Job Search -- programs offering only a job search component.
- Job Search Training -- programs offering job search training (e.g., job finding clubs, training in techniques for employability), either alone or in combination with job search.
- Intensive Services -- programs that provide more in-depth forms of remediation to a substantial portion of participants including, educational services (e.g., remedial education, English as a second language, or high school equivalency classes), skills training (classroom-based or on-the-job), work experience, or work-fare.

As will be discussed in the next chapter, there is great diversity in the types of services being offered in the E&T Program, and the extent to which participants are involved in these services. This typology was developed to ensure that the many program variants were represented in the evaluation.

In addition to including all major Program models, the sampling plan used to select participating local FSAs was designed to derive national estimates of overall costs and benefits, as well as separate estimates for each of the three analytical models. The final study sample consists of 55 local FSAs in 23 States, involving almost 13,000 eligible E&T participants.

In order to fulfill the many objectives of this study, the researchers have developed an evaluation strategy with four basic parts.

## Study Components

**1. Implementation Study.** This portion of the study is intended to document the operations of the E&T Program. It is based on five major sources of information:

- plans submitted by the States for FY1988 and FY1989 which allow the description of the E&T programs planned by States and the measurement of the prevalence of various types of E&T services;
- State quarterly reports on E&T Program expenditures and participation;
- an Inventory of Program Operations for the 55 local FSAs included in the study sample — this provides detailed descriptive data about the types of services actually offered, as well as administrative features such as the use of participant support services;

- data on selected demographic, education, and employment background characteristics of E&T Program participants; and,
- interviews with State and local Program staff regarding a variety of other implementation issues and concerns.

**2. The Impact Study.** This aspect of the evaluation is intended to assess the effectiveness of the E&T Program in increasing participants' employment and earnings, and in decreasing their dependence on food stamps and other public assistance benefits. Because individuals are subject to many influences that may have some effect on their economic well-being, the challenge of the impact analysis is to isolate and accurately measure the changes in a person's life that are due only to the service or Program being evaluated. The most outstanding feature of the research approach to this task is the random assignment of potential E&T Program participants to two groups, one subject to the requirements of the E&T Program and a group not subject to those requirements. This arrangement insures that the groups differ initially only in that the treatment group is accepted into the Program, and the control group is denied services. Thus, subsequent differences in outcomes between the two groups can confidently be attributed to the Program.

In addition to measuring the effects of the E&T Program, the impact analysis will also measure the actual services received by the participants. Previous evaluations of employment and training programs have found that many individuals assigned to work-related services have actually received only partial services, or no services at all. For example, it should be expected that many food stamp work registrants assigned to a Program which offers job search followed by job search training will never make it to the second service component of the Program -- some will find employment or cease receiving food stamps; some will fail to cooperate; and a few may simply fail to receive notice of the next requirement. Waiting lists for services can be another cause of participants receiving only a portion of the planned services. Therefore, in order to attribute effects to Program services, information is being collected about the actual experiences of the selected participants including any sanctions levied against non-compliant individuals.

Followup interviews have also been planned with individuals in the two groups at 4, 8, and 12 months following random assignment to collect the following information:

- measures of employment, including whether an individual was employed at all during the followup period, the number of weeks employed, the number of hours per week worked and the type of job or jobs obtained;
- measures of earnings, including the hourly wage, gross earnings and earnings net of taxes and work expenses;
- household income, earned and unearned, from all sources; and

- measures of public benefits received, including, the duration and amount of food stamp benefits and other public benefits, including AFDC, General Assistance (GA), Unemployment Insurance (UI), etc.

**3. The Cost Study.** In order to develop accurate estimates of the cost of the E&T Program, two types of costs must be measured:

- accounted costs which refer to the Federal and State E&T Program funds allocated to Program functions; and
- resource costs which refer to the actual costs of services received by E&T Program participants, regardless of the source of the funds used.

It is necessary to measure both types because accounted costs usually do not fully reflect the true costs of a program. First, States may not report their costs accurately; the reimbursement of some costs at a 100 percent rate might create an incentive to overestimate costs if actual costs are below the 100 grant amount. Second, States may obtain services from other programs. These may not represent additional costs to the E&T Program but do represent costs to the taxpayer. Third, payments to subcontractors for providing services will likely represent a major part of many States' expenditures. Because these subcontracts are often formula-based payments (e.g., a specified amount per service entrant), some will overstate and some will understate the actual resources subcontractors use to provide the services, depending on how good a deal the food stamp agency has negotiated.

**4. The Cost-Effectiveness Study.** The purpose of this last study component is to determine whether the E&T Program is cost-beneficial -- that is, whether there is a positive return on Program expenditures, and if so, the size of that return.

Benefits and costs will be measured as changes from what would have occurred in the absence of the E&T Program. Thus, costs are defined as the value of the additional resources devoted to administration and service provision, plus other participant expenditures such as child care and travel costs. Similarly, benefits include the value of all beneficial outcomes and effects that would not have occurred in the absence of the Program.

As in most public programs, the benefits and costs of the E&T Program may accrue to different people. Taxpayers bear the operational costs of training, for example, while participants receive the benefits of higher earnings. Therefore, net benefits will be assessed from three points of view: participants, taxpayers, and society at large. Net benefits to participants indicate the extent to which participants are better or worse off from having experienced the treatment. Net (monetary) benefits to taxpayers are equivalent to the budgetary impact on the government. Net benefits to society as a whole are the sum of net benefits to participants and taxpayers. All three perspec-

tives are relevant to policy. Programs with positive net benefits to society are generally viewed as worthwhile so long as their redistributive effects are acceptable. By deriving separate estimates of net benefits (or net costs) to participants and taxpayers, a measure of the amount of redistribution implicit within the overall social net benefit is obtained.

#### **Current Status**

As of the date of this report the following study activities have been completed:

- Fifty-five local FSAs in 23 States have agreed to participate in the evaluation study.
- The random assignment process has been completed in all 55 local FSAs -- about 13,000 work registrants have been either assigned to participate in the E&T Program (the treatment group), or have been excused from the mandatory requirements (the control group).
- Four month follow-up interviews are currently being completed with all study participants.
- Program cost data are currently being collected from the participating State and local FSAs.

During the next nine months, the two remaining follow-up interview surveys will be completed, food stamp benefit data will be collected for all study participants, E&T service data will be collected for those assigned to the treatment group, and cost data collection will be completed. Analyses of these data will then be started culminating in a report to Congress by early 1990.

#### **Contents of This Report**

The remainder of this report describes the implementation of the E&T Program. Chapter II contains descriptive information about the various Program models planned by the States and the level of Federal and State funding for the E&T Program. Chapter III discusses local operational procedures. Chapter IV presents descriptive information about the number and type of participants served by the E&T Program, nationally and by Program model, and compares these patterns both to the general food stamp population and to the total population of work registrants.

## II. E&T PROGRAM DESIGN AND SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEMS

### Introduction

The Food Security Act of 1985, and subsequent regulations issued by FNS, allowed State and local FSAs considerable discretion with regard to the implementation of the E&T Program. The primary purpose of this chapter is to examine how this discretion has affected the number of food stamp recipients participating in the Program, the types of services provided, the administrative and organizational arrangements used, and the cost of the Program.

This snapshot of the implementation of the E&T Program in Fiscal Year (FY) 1988 is based on three sources of data: State plans submitted to FNS for FY1988 and FY1989 (which were compared in order to measure changes in the Program over time); required State quarterly performance reports for FY1988; and, an inventory of program operations for the nationally representative sample of 55 local FSAs participating in the evaluation of the E&T Program. For consistency with the State-level data, the information from the sample of local FSAs has been statistically weighted to reflect the characteristics of all agencies operating the E&T Program nationally.

These different sources of data have certain limitations that must be kept in mind when reviewing the information in this chapter. First, E&T Program operations planned by States may not reflect actual service configurations in place in local FSAs. Second, financial reporting by States, as noted in Chapter I, often underestimates the true cost of providing E&T services. Finally, only limited information was collected from the sample of 55 local FSAs during the initial stages of the E&T evaluation, reducing the degree to which operational differences can be detected, and where found, explained. The data to be available at the end of the evaluation study will resolve many of these questions — detailed data are being collected on both Program costs and the day-to-day experiences of a large national sample of E&T participants.

This description of the E&T Program is organized into six sections:

- E&T Services and Program Models, including the types of services offered, geographic coverage within States, and the extent to which E&T services represent an expansion of previously implemented job search programs;
- Participant Support Services, including the types of services provided, and the varying modes of reimbursements used;
- The Service Delivery System, including linkage and integration with other service providers and employment and training programs, and the basic administrative structure used for service delivery;
- E&T Program Target Populations, Exemption Criteria and Planned Participation Levels, including policy regarding the group or groups of individuals expected to participate in the E&T Program, exemptions from participation, and overall participation goals;

- E&T Program Funding and Spending, including planned E&T Program budgets and actual spending for FY1988; and
- Planned E&T Program Changes for FY1989, including changes planned by States for participation goals and services.

The following chapter focuses on day-to-day operations in local FSAs.

## A. E&T PROGRAM SERVICES

State FSAs had considerable latitude in deciding what types of services to include as part of their E&T Program. The options ranged from simple job search to more intensive services such as educational programs and work experience. How individual States responded to this flexibility was, however, affected by a number of concomitant factors. First, the planning period afforded States was short — final regulations were issued by FNS on December 31, 1986 requiring States to submit their E&T plans by March 2, 1987 and begin operations by April 1, 1987.

Second, the available options required different levels of funding. Some, such as extended education or work experience, are intended to serve those individuals in greater need of remediation and, as a consequence, are significantly more costly per participant than simple job search. Therefore, a decision to include particular service components, and the extent of their use (i.e., the number of participants to be included), has substantial financial implications for States. But, different types of services may differ in their ability to affect the employment, earnings and welfare dependency of the participants. If effective, these services can reduce State welfare expenditures by getting individuals off public assistance thereby offsetting some of the added cost.

Finally, the choice of services to offer in the E&T Program did not take place in a vacuum. State and local FSAs had been previously providing job search services as well as employment and training programs for other public assistance recipients (e.g., WIN). As a result, States had an incentive to coordinate these different efforts to the extent possible. Moreover, linking the E&T Program to other State agency or programs (e.g., JTPA) would also allow State FSAs to leverage additional resources, to achieve certain economies of scale through more efficient operations, and to avoid having to "reinvent the wheel."


### Types of E&T Program Services Planned by States

As shown in Exhibit II.1\*, job search was the E&T service component most commonly planned by States for FY1988; 49 out of 53 State FSAs included this option. Job search training was also widely planned as a service, being offered by 41 States. This finding regarding the prevalence of job search activities is not too surpris-

---

\* State by State information can be found in Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2.

**Exhibit II.1**  
**E&T Program Services Planned by the States, FY1988**



SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program plans.

\* Includes: on-the-job training, supported employment, vocational rehabilitation, and home-based employment.

ing. These services were often part of the FSP prior to the implementation of the E&T Program. It also reflects the intent of the States to serve as many participants as possible with the funds available in order to meet specified performance standards starting in FY1989 (job search is generally the least expensive type of service).

States also planned a variety of more intensive education and training services. For example, 35 States planned for some adult educational services (including, for example, GED or literacy training) for those E&T Program participants needing such assistance. In addition, 33 States included the provision of vocational education services, and 19 States incorporated work experience or workfare programs.

It appears, then, that States have responded to the new E&T Program initiative in a way that conforms with the intent of the enabling legislation and regulations. Job search, the least costly service and the one expected to move many employable participants into jobs, has been included in the service configurations of almost every State. Beyond this, States have chosen to add a broad mix of services involving different levels of intensity. What is not known at this time, however, is the extent to which the different types of services are actually used, i.e., how many participants receive the various services. This information will not be available until the end of the evaluation study.

#### Service Configurations


Although, as noted above, there exists a mix of services available to participants in the E&T Program, for analytical purposes it is useful to categorize State and local FSA programs into the three models mentioned in Chapter I: Job Search, Job Search Training, and Intensive Service. While the use of such a typology masks the variety that exists in the E&T Program, it is a convenient analytical device, particularly when Program effects (e.g., changes in participant earnings) will be estimated later in the evaluation study.

Exhibit II.2 groups local FSAs according to the three service models. As shown, over half of local FSAs nationally can be categorized as Intensive Service model FSAs and about one-fourth can be classified in each of the other two groups. But, because there are more large FSAs in the Job Search category, the distribution of E&T participants provides a somewhat different picture. For example, although Job Search model FSAs account for about one-fourth of the total, these FSAs serve about four out of every ten E&T participants. However, it is still the case that for the majority of participants (about two-thirds) the E&T Program provides at least the opportunity to obtain services beyond job search.


#### Geographic Coverage

In FY1986, 38 States were operating job search programs for food stamp work registrants. With the advent of the E&T Program, States were afforded an opportunity to either continue or expand existing programs, or initiate services not presently available. To examine the States' response to this opportunity, Exhibit II.3 shows the extent to which the E&T Program represented an expansion (or contraction) of services as measured by the change in geographic coverage, i.e., a

**Exhibit II.2**  
**Percent of Local FSAs Implementing E&T Program Service Models,**  
**and Percent of Total Participants Covered, FY1988**



**Percent of Local FSAs**




**Percent of E&T Participants**

SOURCE: Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

### Exhibit II.3

#### Percent of Counties\* with E&T Program in FY1988 Compared with Percent of Counties with Job Search Program in FY1986, by State



comparison of the change in the percent of counties (often synonymous with a local FSA) with an operating program. (Detailed State data can be found in Appendix B, Table 3).

Most States (42 out of 53) significantly expanded the availability of food stamp employment and training services under the E&T Program; only seven decreased geographic coverage. (In some instances this was due to reduced Federal funding). In fact, 18 of 53 State FSAs planned statewide participation for FY1988, and an additional 11 State FSAs planned to operate the Program in more than 50 percent of their counties. The E&T Program, then, not only increased the variety of services available to food stamp work registrants, but also made these services available to a larger proportion of the eligible population than under the previous job search programs.

**Change From  
Previous Job  
Search Program**

The short planning time available at the outset of the E&T Program would be expected to inhibit States from creating new services for food stamp recipients. Many States already had a job search program in place, and because this is an allowable component under E&T, the simple response would have been to continue the previous services.

As shown in Exhibit II.4, for about three-quarters of the local FSAs in FY1988, the E&T services that were implemented represented either an entirely new program, or one markedly different from the previously existing job search services. As would be expected, local FSAs categorized as Job Search models were most likely to have retained their old program; those categorized as Intensive Service models were most likely to have created a new program for their food stamp recipients. This is quite encouraging. Congress intended the E&T Program to be a new initiative and, for the most part, States have responded to this challenge.

**B. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT SERVICES**


**Type of  
Reimbursement  
Method**

It has long been recognized that individuals involved in employment and training programs often incur additional expenses as a result of their participation. Most often these expenses are due to the cost of transportation for job search or for commuting to a training or work experience site. In those instances where participants are caring for dependents, child care may also be needed.

As required by the enabling legislation, States must reimburse E&T Program participants for their training-related expenses. Participants can either be reimbursed for their actual expenses or receive a standard allowance that reasonably reflects their likely expenses. If States choose this latter option, they must allow participants the opportunity to request an actual cost reimbursement if they have exceeded the standard allowance. However, the Federal government only pays 50 percent of such reimbursements up to a maximum of \$25 per month per participant. States choosing to pay participant expenses beyond this amount must do so with State funds.

**Exhibit II.4**  
**Comparison of New E&T Program to Previously Existing**  
**Food Stamp Job Search Program**

Percent of Local FSAs



**SOURCE:** Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

How States chose to implement this provision has important implications both for the individual participants, as well as for the resources needed to operate the E&T Program. Moreover, the effect of States' reimbursement policies will vary depending upon the type of E&T services being provided. For example, in Job Search model programs, participant expenses are likely to be more predictable, and to vary less among participants, than expenses for participants in Intensive Service model programs. One might, therefore, expect the standard rate for reimbursing expenses to be used more often by Job Search model States than by Intensive Service model States.

As it turns out, State plans for the method of participant reimbursement follow the expected pattern. That is, about two-thirds of local FSAs categorized as Intensive Service models reimburse participants for actual expenses while only about one in six local FSAs categorized as Job Search models use this method. Overall, local FSAs are almost evenly split, about half reimburse participants according to a standard rate and half reimburse participants for actual expenses. But, it still remains the case that States offering more intensive employment services have generally recognized the higher cost of these services to the participants by allowing a more flexible approach to providing financial assistance.

#### Provision of In-kind Support Services

In addition to reimbursing E&T Program participants for their Program-related expenses, some local FSAs also support participants with in-kind services. Nationally, about four out of ten provide some sort of child care services, transportation assistance (e.g., reduced public transportation fare systems), or other services including counseling and referral services. Often, these additional services are not financed by E&T Program funds, but represent the use of other available resources. For example, some local FSAs use Title XX funds to help finance E&T Program participants' child care expenses; others use local or county-based resources, such as special funds set aside for use by work and welfare programs, to help pay for participants' expenses associated with accepting employment (e.g., the cost of buying uniforms or tools).

This is an important finding. First, State and local FSA administrators have certainly recognized the needs of the E&T participants. As many local staff have reported, one of the more common reasons for non-cooperation with work programs like E&T is the inability to commute to and from the local office (or a work site) and/or to find someone to care for dependent children. Second, it indicates that State and local FSAs have been successful in obtaining and using available resources for the benefit of E&T participants.

### **C. THE E&T PROGRAM SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM**

#### Linkages With Other Service Providers and Programs

The E&T Program was planned and implemented in the context of a variety of existing work and welfare programs, and many of the services now provided by local FSAs were already being delivered by other agencies and institutions. Consequently, most State and local FSAs were able to take advantage of these existing resources in planning and implementing the E&T Program in

two important ways. First, they did not have to "start from scratch" to design their programs. As noted above, despite a short planning period, most local FSAs were able to implement new and expanded services for food stamp recipients. Without the availability of such resources, State response to this new initiative would likely have been different.

Second, and perhaps more important, the availability of existing services provided an opportunity to achieve additional efficiencies. For example, some States planned to maximize the use of JTPA services for E&T participants. Others elected to serve E&T participants by expanding the coverage of an existing comprehensive work and welfare program (typically designed to serve GA or AFDC recipients). By doing so, States may have been able to both increase the efficiency with which services are provided (by serving more individuals, unit costs can generally be decreased), and, if the Program is successful, decrease welfare expenditures to those individuals able to find employment. Pooling funds from different sources (Food Stamp E&T, AFDC-WIN, and State-funded GA) may have allowed States to expand the services available to food stamp recipients beyond those which could have otherwise been provided using only E&T Program resources.

Such interagency linkages may be categorized as either service "integration" or "coordination". For the purposes of this discussion, an integrated program is one operated jointly by the local FSA and some other agency or program, or one in which the local FSA contracts directly with another agency for the provision of services. For example, in a State in which a comprehensive work and welfare program has been implemented (the ET Choices Program in Massachusetts, or the GAIN Program in California), the E&T Program is more likely to be administered as part of the larger program.


A coordinated program, on the other hand, is one that is operated as a separate entity by the FSA, but which has sought the cooperation of other programs in an effort to forego the duplication of services or other possible conflicts. For example, the local FSA may refer E&T participants to JTPA for all or some of its needed services.

Exhibit II.5 illustrates the extent to which local FSAs have integrated or coordinated the E&T Program with other agencies and programs. The top figure depicts the proportion of local FSAs that are either integrated or coordinated with other agencies, or are independent stand-alone programs; the bottom figure illustrates the agencies or programs with which local FSAs have established linkages.


Overall, almost three-quarters of local FSAs have integrated their E&T program with other agencies -- less than ten percent have implemented independently administered programs. There is some variation, however, in the degree to which local FSAs have attempted to integrate or coordinate the E&T Program with other providers and programs (see Appendix B, Table 5). Local FSAs categorized as either a Job Search or Intensive Service model, are far more likely to establish linkages with other agencies than those categorized as a Job

**Exhibit II.5**  
**Local FSA Integration and Coordination of the**  
**E&T Program with Other Agencies and Programs, FY1988**

**Type of Linking  
with Other Agencies**



**Type of Agency Used**



**SOURCE:** Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

\* Includes Job Corps, Community Action Agencies, Salvation Army, migrant worker organizations and the military.

Search Training model. For example, all Intensive Service model FSAs and over 90 percent of local Job Search FSAs have integrated or coordinated their programs with other agencies, most often local JTPA, State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs), or educational agencies. In contrast, only about three-quarters of the local Job Search Training model FSAs have established links with other agencies or programs.

The most commonly used external provider of services for the E&T Program is the local JTPA agency, used by about three-quarters of local FSAs. As JTPA is required to serve food stamp recipients as part of its ongoing operations, many local FSAs simply refer interested E&T participants to JTPA programs; others contract formally with the local JTPA agency for the provision of various services, including traditional vocational skills training, adult basic education, vocational assessments and work experience. About two-third of the local FSAs have used SESAs in a similar way, primarily as a reference for mainstream services (generally job search).

The nature of the linkage also varies. For example, E&T participants may either simply be referred to a local education agency as a source of possible services, or the local FSA may take a more active role and establish a contractual arrangement to provide specific services to a stipulated number of E&T participants. Typically, education agencies (used by two-thirds of local FSAs) provide adult basic education and GED training services, with some local schools also providing literacy training and vocational education services. Some local FSAs have also contracted for similar services with community colleges.

In addition to forging linkages with public agencies and programs, local FSAs have also developed relationships with private non-profit and for-profit organizations. For example, almost one-third of local FSAs have some association with a private contractor, and almost 4 out of 10 have a relationship with local community-based organizations including the local Salvation Army, YMCA, Goodwill, literacy council, and other private, non-profit voluntary public interest and social welfare organizations.

Only about one out of six local FSAs have integrated or coordinated E&T with WIN/WIN Demonstration or GA work and training programs. This infrequency of association is probably due to Federal food stamp work registration policy which exempts mandatory WIN registrants from the E&T Program.

#### **Assignment of Administrative Responsibility**

In addition to differences in the extent to which external linkages are established, local E&T programs can also differ with respect to the assignment of day-to-day administrative responsibility. E&T services are provided by any one, or a combination of, the following administrative entities:

- local FSA eligibility workers;
- a separate employment unit within the local FSA;

- an Employment and Training agency or division operated within a State's Social Services Agency; and,
- another organization (either public or private) contracted to provide the primary E&T service or services.

As shown in Exhibit II.6, the most common administrative arrangement, used by about one-third of the local FSAs, is a separate employment unit within the local FSA. If the two methods of administration that confine the provision of Program services to the local FSA are combined -- either the food stamp eligibility worker or the employment unit -- over half of Job Search model FSAs, and almost two-thirds of Job Search Training model FSAs, administer the E&T Program themselves (see Appendix B, Table 6). This is in stark contrast to the 16 percent of local Intensive Service model FSAs that have taken this approach. This distribution is not surprising, given the relatively narrow range and short-term nature of the services provided by Job Search and Job Search Training model FSAs. It is also not unexpected that Intensive Services model FSAs, with their wider range of services, are much more likely to be administered by a comprehensive work and welfare program that combines services for food stamp, GA and AFDC recipients. Examples of such comprehensive programs are the ET Choices Program in Massachusetts, the MOST (More Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency and Training) Program in Michigan, and Project Chance in Illinois.

#### **D. PARTICIPANT EXEMPTIONS AND PROGRAM TARGETING**


The selection of food stamp work registrants for participation in the E&T Program can be viewed as a series of decision steps -- at each stage in the process only certain individuals are chosen on the basis of established criteria.

First, legislative exemptions categorically eliminate many food stamp recipients, i.e., those caring for young children, those under age 17 or over 59, students, those employed 30 hours or more per week, and individuals participating in certain other welfare-related work programs. Beyond this, States may choose to further target E&T services using one or more of the following permitted options:

- States may exempt work registrants living in areas in which there is a lack of available services or job opportunities or where the number of work registrants is very low.
- States may exempt work registrants during their first thirty days of participation in the FSP.
- Finally, States may promulgate policies that allow for individual exemptions on the basis of such barriers to participation as lack of transportation or child care.

The only constraint is that States must meet performance standards specified by FNS in the E&T regulations -- 35 percent of nonexempt work registrants must be served during FY1989, and 50 percent must be served in FY1990 and subsequent years.

**Exhibit II.6**  
**Administrative Provision of E&T Program Services, FY1988**



SOURCE: Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

Exhibit II.7 summarizes the response of States to these various options (detailed data by State and service model can be found in Appendix B, Table 7). Only three States have chosen to exempt work registrants in their first 30 days of food stamp reciprocity. This is not surprising given the regulatory incentive against using this exemption option (States not using this option can lower the base of mandatory work registrants used to calculate performance standards by 10 percent).

Most States have, however, incorporated the use of other categorical exemptions, with geographic exemption due to remoteness, lack of jobs, or lack of training opportunities being the most common (used in 37 States). This is to be expected because, as noted earlier, only 18 States planned to implement the E&T Program statewide in FY1988. In addition to geographic exemptions, some States also allow categorical exemptions for other reasons, such as being registered for a GA work and welfare program (2 States), or being in a household with three or more children. Only 10 States allow no categorical exemptions.

All but three States also have policies regarding individual exemptions. Over three quarters of the States allow individual exemptions for problems with child care, transportation problems, or for temporary health problems. Among the other individual exemptions used by States are family or personal problems, catastrophic events, homelessness accompanied by a social barrier, women in their third trimester of pregnancy, women residing in shelters for abused women, and certain language barriers.



Exhibit II.8 depicts the filtering process planned by States for the selection of E&T participants in FY1988.\* First, exemptions established by legislation regarding who is subject to the work registration requirements were expected to focus work policy on a group representing about 10 percent of all food stamp recipients. Of this pool of about 3.3 million individuals, State and local exemption decisions were expected to screen out about one-fourth, leaving approximately 2.3 million individuals. Finally, other State and local targeting decisions were expected to further reduce this number by about one-third to 1.6 million -- the expected number of nonexempt E&T participants States planned to serve in FY1988. As a result, the number of individuals planned for E&T service in FY1988 represents about two-thirds of all nonexempt work registrants, and almost half of all food stamp recipients classified as work registrants.

In addition to the required E&T participants, States also planned for participation by volunteers as encouraged by the 1985 Act. But, the expected level of such participation was low -- overall, volunteers accounted for only about 6 percent of total planned E&T participation

---

\* Detailed data for each State is provided in Appendix B, Table 8.


**Exhibit II.7**  
**State Exemption Policy for Mandatory Work Registrants, FY1988**



\* Includes family or personal problems, catastrophic events, homelessness accompanied by a social barrier, pregnant women in their third trimester.

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program Plans.

**Exhibit II.8**  
**E&T Program Participation Resulting From**  
**Exemption and Targeting Policies, FY1988**



\* Estimated total number of food stamp recipients participating in a year. This is computed by multiplying the average monthly participation of 18.68 million by the average rate of caseload turnover of 1.7, i.e., total annual participation equals 1.7 times the average monthly caseload.

SOURCES: FNS, USDA, Food Stamp Statistical Summary, July 1987, June 1988  
State E&T Program plans for FY1988

(see Appendix B, Table 8). What is not clear at this time is whether this represents an intent by States to serve few volunteers, or an expectation on their part that few individuals are likely to volunteer for the services being made available.

### **E. FY1988 E&T PROGRAM FUNDING AND SPENDING**

In addition to the variety of operational and participation choices made as part of implementing the E&T Program in FY1988, States also faced decisions regarding funding levels. Federal funding for the E&T Program consisted of three types of financial support:

- A 100 percent grant allocated to States on the basis of the relative size of their FSP caseloads. FY1988, these funds totaled \$60 million.
- A 50 percent match of additional Program service costs. In FY1988, planned Federal and State budgets for this funding component totaled about \$100 million.
- A 50 percent match of participant reimbursements up to a maximum of \$25 per person per month. In FY1988, planned Federal and State budgets for this funding component totaled about \$64 million.

For FY1988, the planned Federal and State expenditures for the E&T program totaled \$224 million. This section summarizes the funding decisions embodied in the FY1988 State plans, and compares planned and actual spending for this same fiscal year.

#### **Planned E&T Program Funding Levels**

Exhibit II.9 summarizes average FY1988 State planned funding levels, by the three analytical service models. These categories are used to examine whether there is any relationship between the cost per participant and the intensity of services offered, i.e., if the unit costs planned for Intensive Service model programs exceed the costs for the other two models. (Detailed costs by State and type of grant can be found in Appendix B, Table 9.)

As shown in this exhibit, unit costs follow the expected pattern. That is, planned costs per participant are highest for States categorized as an Intensive Service model at \$210 per participant, and those categorized as Job Search model States are the lowest at \$58 per participant. But, it is difficult at this time to draw any firm conclusions from these figures for several reasons.

First, these figures represent planned costs and participation; information on actual expenditures and participation levels is not now available. Second, within a category of States, the average per participant costs exhibit wide variation, with many instances of more intense (and presumably more costly) programs appearing to be less expensive than simpler job search programs, and visa versa. This can be the result of a number of factors including:

**Exhibit II.9**  
**State Planned Cost per E&T Participant**  
**by Service Model, FY1988**

	Model 1: Job Search	Model 2: Job Search Training	Model 3: Intensive Services
Service cost per participant	\$33	\$90	\$155
Average participant reimbursement	\$25	\$27	\$55
Total cost per participant	\$58	\$118	\$210

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program Plans

- States have been classified on the basis of the most prevalent type of service component. Even within programs classified as a Job Search model, other types of services may be offered. The extent to which this occurs can alter the overall cost of an individual State program.
- FSAs also differ in the extent to which they have been able to forge linkages with other State agencies and programs which, in all likelihood, affects the apparent cost of the E&T Program.
- The way in which services are actually delivered may differ in important ways so that similarly titled components may, in fact, be very different. For example, there is a fundamental difference between referring E&T participants to a school district for adult education classes, and actually contracting with the school district to provide such training.

Some additional insight into this issue can be gained by examining data on actual Federal expenditures for FY1988 (see Appendix B, Table 10 for detailed information for each State). Although these data represent only Federal costs (State expenditure information is not reported to FNS), they do show that Federal expenditures for FY1988 have fallen substantially below planned costs. Actual Federal expenditures for FY1988 totaled about \$98.7 million, compared to budgeted costs of about \$138.5 million; this is a shortfall of approximately 30 percent.

Based on information available through June 1988 (i.e., for the first three quarters of FY1988), it is expected that Program participation will also be less than planned (complete participation data for FY1988 are not available at this time). Compared to planned participation of about 1.6 million individuals, it now appears that States will probably serve about one million persons -- a similar shortfall of about 37 percent. While it is again difficult to draw any firm conclusion from these data, it seems that the lower than expected Program cost is a result of lower than predicted participation levels.

This should not be construed to be a failure of the E&T Program. Rather, States appear to have initially over-estimated the number of recipients who would be both subject to the work registration requirement, and not subsequently exempted from E&T participation. Given the short planning period afforded State FSAs, and the lack of reliable information on which to base these estimates, it is not too surprising that States' projections proved somewhat inaccurate. Although the penetration of the E&T Program could be increased (for example, many States have exempted a significant proportion of their counties from participation), these figures do indicate that a large number of individuals are being served. To put this in context, participation in all AFDC work programs -- WIN Demonstration, CWEP,

and grant diversion -- totals about 714,000 individuals nationally\*, or less than half the number projected to be in the Food Stamp E&T Program. The E&T Program is a major effort and, if successful, offers at least the potential of significantly altering the lives of a large number of low-income households.

#### F. PLANNED E&T PROGRAM CHANGES FOR FY89

This final section examines the extent to which States opted to alter their E&T programs in FY1989 from those in place in FY1988. For this purpose, State plans for FY1988 were compared to those recently submitted to FNS for FY1989.

##### Planned E&T Program Changes in Participation Levels

For FY1989, States have planned to serve fewer participants than was planned for FY1988 -- 1.4 million compared to 1.6 million in FY1988 (see Table 11 in Appendix B). It is encouraging that States appear to have used their FY1988 experiences to "fine tune" their plans for next year, and have also planned to substantially increase the number of participants actually receiving E&T services by about 40 percent (i.e., comparing the projected enrollment of about one million served in FY1988 to FY1989 plans to serve about 1.4 million). For example, a majority of States (all but 6) have planned to expand the availability of the E&T Program to more areas of their respective States in FY1989. In fact, the number of States planning complete statewide coverage is expected to increase from 18 in FY1988 to 26 in FY1989.

##### Planned Changes in Services for FY89

The second major area in which States might be expected to change E&T program operations in FY1989, is the type of service components offered to participants. This may occur for any number of reasons including, for example, the opportunity to add a service component that could not be previously incorporated because of the speed with which the Program was initially implemented. Because States have been given a great deal of flexibility to design an E&T Program that best fits their unique circumstances, it would be expected that programs will evolve over time.

Between FY1988 and FY1989, most States planned relatively modest changes in service components. As shown in Exhibit II.10, the largest changes appear to have occurred with respect to three service areas: workfare, which was dropped by all States having this component in FY1988; and, work experience and vocational education, each dropped by about one-third of the States originally offering these components. At this time, no explanation for these changes is available. But, in light of the number of States adding these components, it may be that what is being observed here is a process of experimentation with available options. Because the E&T Program is

---

\* U.S. General Accounting Office, Work and Welfare: Current AFDC Work Programs and Implications for Federal Policy, GAO-HRD-87-34, Washington, D.C., January 1987.

**Exhibit II.10**  
**Change in Planned E&T Program Service Components, FY1988 vs. FY1989**

Service Component	Number of States with Component in FY1988	Number of States Adding Component in FY 1989	Number of States Deleting Component in FY 1989	Net Change FY88 vs. FY89
Job Search	49	2	1	+1
Job Search Training	37	6	5	+1
Other Educational Services	33	5	5	0
Vocational Education	30	7	9	-2
Work Experience	13	5	4	+1
Workfare	7	5	7	-2

SOURCE: State E&T Program Plans for FY1988 and FY1989.

still new, such changes should be seen as a positive outcome. Rather than adopting rigid approaches to serving food stamp recipients, States appear to be willing to try different ways to help them obtain employment.

## G. SUMMARY

This chapter has discussed a broad range of topics related to the nature of the E&T Program implemented by States in FY1988, including the types of services provided, participant exemption criteria and support services, administrative arrangements with other agencies and programs, and Program participation levels and costs. Rather than summarizing each of these areas, it is more important here to point out five themes that emerge from these data:

- E&T is a varied program. Congress intended the E&T Program to be flexible enough to allow States an opportunity to design programs that best suit their unique needs. In this regard, the Program appears to have been successful. States have provided food stamp recipients with a variety of employment and training opportunities, and have provided these services through a wide range of different sources (e.g., JTPA, SESA, local educational institutions, community colleges, and other public and private community-based agencies).
- FSA's have recognized the needs of individual participants. States have attempted to help participants complete their employment and training programs. Where financial burdens can be a barrier (especially in the case of more intensive service components), States have made an effort to take a more flexible approach to reimbursing them for their out-of-pocket expenses. Many local FSA's have also provided in-kind support services such as child care arrangements and transportation services.
- State programs reflect new initiatives. Although States could have simply extended their old job search programs to comply with the E&T mandate, this did not occur. About three-quarters of local FSA's have implemented either entirely new programs, or ones markedly different from previously existing job search services.
- The Program is serving a large number of food stamp recipients. By both legislation and regulation, States are permitted to use a wide range of exemptions to determine who among the pool of mandatory work registrants must participate in the E&T Program. States have made considerable use of these exemptions, particularly geographic area exclusions. Projected E&T enrollment for FY1988 is approximately one million mandatory work registrants and volunteers — about one-third of the total pool of all eligible work registrants. It is important to keep in mind, however, that the E&T Program is larger than all of the AFDC work programs put together, and that FY1988 was the first full year of operation of the Program.

- E&T is an evolving program. Comparing Program plans for FY1988 and FY1989 reveals that States are learning from their past experiences. Rather than adopting rigid approaches to meet Federal requirements, States appear quite willing to experiment with new service components. Again, this is an encouraging outcome -- Congress allowed States an opportunity to try different ways to assist low-income persons obtain gainful employment, and States appear willing to seek alternative ways to achieve this goal.

In addition, States plan to substantially expand services in FY1989 -- planned enrollment for FY1988 is about 40 percent higher than that projected for FY1988.

### III. E&T PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS

This chapter examines the day-to-day administrative and operational details of the E&T Program using data from the nationally representative sample of 55 local FSAs included in the E&T evaluation. The data have been statistically weighted to represent national totals.

The activities necessary to operate the E&T Program can be categorized into four tasks: determination of work registration status and service referral; screening and service assignment; participant monitoring; and adjudication of noncompliance. Each of these tasks, shown in Exhibit III.1, is discussed below.

#### Determination of Work Registration Status and Service Referral

At the time of application (or recertification) all household members, whether or not they are present, are evaluated to determine their work registration status. This is largely a clerical function because this determination is well defined in Federal regulations. Moreover, most local FSAs had integrated this activity into normal FSP certification procedures prior to the implementation of the E&T Program. The one important change brought about by E&T is that food stamp eligibility workers now must determine who among the work registrants is required to participate in the Program, i.e., E&T participants are drawn from the pool of FSP recipients who are categorized as work registrants.

The next E&T Program activity is typically the referral of participants to the employment and training unit. Usually this referral does not occur until the eligibility staff determine that an applicant is eligible for food stamp benefits. However, in about 10 percent of the local FSAs applicants are required to begin E&T participation before they receive any food stamp benefits.

Once the referrals are received, the administrative unit or agency responsible for providing E&T Program services notifies the non-exempt work registrants (usually by mail) of the date and time of their initial interview. In a few FSAs (about 15%), the same staff both determine FSP eligibility and provide E&T services. In these cases, the certification or recertification interview and the first E&T Program interview occur simultaneously.


#### Participant Screening and Service Assignment

Generally, the next step in the administration of the E&T Program is the screening of potential participants (i.e., determining whether a nonexempt food stamp recipient or applicant is ready or suitable for the Program) and assignment to the employment and training service(s) that is most appropriate for the individual.

At the initial screening interview, the assigned employment and training worker determines whether the individual has any cause to be excused from participation in the E&T Program. For example, certain individuals may have medical problems or disabilities, transportation difficulties, or child care responsibilities that may be legitimate barriers to participation. State and local FSAs may also decide to excuse participation for individuals who are seasonal workers,

**Exhibit III.1  
GENERAL MODEL OF E&T PROCESS**

42



temporarily laid-off, or certified for food stamps for very short periods of time. In almost two-thirds of the local FSAs, the employment and training staff or agency are able to excuse clients (often temporarily) from participation. In the remaining third of the local FSAs, the employment and training staff may request that the food stamp eligibility worker reconsider the individual's work registration status, but cannot make the final determination themselves.

For employment and training workers, verifying exemption claims frequently involves protracted case reviews and contact with the recipient. For caseworkers who are permitted some measure of discretion over exemption claims, and who may have heavy caseload burdens, there are clear incentives to exempt from the Program those individuals who would appear to pose administrative difficulties. However, this tendency appears to be more likely for those workers who are employed in the same agency as the food stamp caseworkers, than for staff who have been contracted to administer the Program. The latter are generally subject to stricter performance standards regarding participation and services than are workers in local FSAs.

Once screening is completed, the next step in the E&T process is service assignment. Three basic approaches are used:

- Fixed Sequence of Components which requires participants to first undergo a period of mandatory job search as a test for job-readiness. This approach is based on the theory that if an individual cannot obtain employment after a period of job search, he/she may require additional training to find a job.
- Staff Assessment which relies on Program staff to make a determination of the participant's job-readiness. This assessment of employability, usually carried out during a meeting with an employment counselor, is then used to distinguish job-ready participants (those for whom job search or placement activities are most appropriate) from participants who require more intensive education and training to compete successfully in the job market.\*
- Participant Choice methods which recognize that a major condition of success is participant motivation. Program staff present participants with a menu of available options and allow them to choose among them. This method can also be used in combination with staff assessment. For example, in some instances assessments are used to narrow down the array of choices before

---

\* Under current regulations, this type of assessment is not considered a service component. However, in-depth counseling sessions, combined with work experience or employment job search or training, can constitute an approved E&T component.



**Exhibit III.2**  
**Method of Program Screening and**  
**Service Assignment in the E&T Program, FY1988**

Method of Screening and Assignment	Model 1: Job Search (% local FSAs)	Model 2: Job Search Training (% local FSAs)	Model 3: Intensive Services (% local FSAs)	All Models (% local FSAs)
Fixed Sequence of Components	50	59	20	36
Assessment Determines Assignment	50	41	79	63
A) Participants Allowed Some Choice	30	12	56	41
B) No Choice Allowed	20	29	23	22

SOURCE: Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

to make two return visits to their assigned employment and training worker to discuss the progress of their efforts. On the other hand, job search training services generally require participants to attend an initial group training session followed by three to eight weeks of job search. In some instances, local FSAs require participants to attend a weekly training workshop throughout their required period of job search. In the first case, monitoring is usually done through scheduled visits; in the latter case, monitoring is combined with the training workshops.

Intensive Service FSAs employ a wide variety of methods but two general approaches are most commonly used: scheduled monitoring visits, and participant documentation of activity completion. In the first instance, participants are required to visit their E&T worker at regular intervals during the period of their assigned service. In the second case, participants are only required to submit documentation that they have completed a specified activity. For example, individuals assigned to GED classes may be required to submit copies of attendance records and GED certification when they have attained their degree. Because such services can take a long time to complete, this approach provides very limited monitoring opportunities.

**Determination  
of  
Noncompliance**

State and local FSAs are required to develop a system to determine and adjudicate instances of noncompliance. Participants may be considered noncompliant for a variety of reasons, including failure to:

- respond to the initial and follow-up request(s) for their first interview with employment and training staff;
- contact the required number of employers as part of their job search;
- provide employer contact information;
- attend educational or vocational classroom training; appear at a worksite if they are enrolled in workfare or on-the-job training;
- provide documentation of their attendance at training; or,
- appear for their scheduled monitoring visits.

Individuals determined to be out of compliance become ineligible to participate in the FSP; if the individual is the head of the household, the entire household becomes ineligible. This period of ineligibility continues for two months or until the individual complies with the E&T requirements, leaves the household, or becomes exempt, whichever occurs first. Individuals determined noncompliant must be provided with a notice of adverse action within ten days informing them of the proposed period of disqualification, and what actions can be taken to avoid, or "cure", the sanction.

If noncompliant participants contact Program staff and provide a good cause for their failure to comply, they are either re-referred to the employment and training unit or excused from participation. The

latter might occur if the noncompliance was due to a medical, transportation, or child care problem. If noncompliant participants fail to establish good cause, or do not respond to the notice of adverse action, food stamp caseworkers initiate sanction procedures. However, this may not always occur. In fact, about one-third of the local FSAs indicate that they will "try anything to avoid sanctioning a client." In such instances, this action might be taken only if the participant makes no effort to contact staff after several requests. For example, some local FSAs allow participants a 30-day grace period from sanctions, if they agree to cooperate; others indicate that they only sanction as "a last resort" and will make numerous attempts to get participants to cooperate.

Participants can go through repeated cycles of noncompliance and curing which can last for the individual's entire period of certification for food stamp benefits. As a consequence, many State and local administrators expressed the view that existing sanction procedures are too lenient, and suggested revising Program regulations to limit individuals to no more than one notification prior to the initiation of sanctions. Many E&T Program staff view improvements in sanctioning policies as the key to the Program's success. Without the enforcement of sanctions, staff believe that they lose the leverage they need to induce participants to meet their E&T requirements.

In addition to this curing process, noncompliant participants are sometimes not sanctioned because of poor communication between the employment and training staff and food stamp caseworkers. In fact, communications between food stamp and E&T workers are often reported to be strained. Food stamp caseworkers frequently report feeling, as one individual put it, "left out of the entire process" because they often do not hear about the progress of a particular case unless a sanction is requested from the E&T worker. One administrator claimed that "the food stamp workers basically have no idea what happens to the client once the client gets to Job Service", and rarely hear about successful outcomes. One organizational approach that appears to reduce these problems, and improve communications, is the co-location of E&T staff and food stamp caseworkers.

## Summary

Although E&T Program services vary, the process viewed by individual participants is relatively consistent from office to office. First, eligibility workers determine the work registration status of individuals applying for (or being recertified for) food stamp benefits. Once determined to be a work registrant, individuals are generally referred to a separate employment and training office to receive services -- in all but about ten percent of local FSAs that serve applicants this next step takes place after they are determined eligible for food stamp benefits.

Upon arriving at the employment and training unit for their initial interview, work registrants are next screened for possible exemption from E&T requirements (i.e., those facing difficulties related to child care, transportation or health conditions). This process is often problematic for local staff because many of the reasons for exemption are difficult to verify, allowing certain recipients an opportunity to abuse the current Program.

Once determined to be nonexempt E&T participants, individuals are next assigned to a service component. In most local FSAs, this step is relatively straightforward because only one service is being offered -- often job search. Where alternatives are available (e.g., in Intensive Service FSAs) over three-quarters of the local FSAs use some sort of caseworker assessment to determine the most appropriate service component; over half allow participants an opportunity to choose among a menu of available options.

During the course of their participation in the E&T Program, local FSAs generally require individuals to report their progress. How this is done varies by the type of service to which the individual is assigned. Job search and job search training services generally specify some type of regularly scheduled monitoring visit to meet with an assigned employment and training caseworker. In more intensive services (e.g., educational components), participants are often required to submit documentation of completion of their assigned activity (e.g., GED certification).

The final step in the general process is related to failure to cooperate with the E&T requirements. Although under current regulations participants are subject to loss of benefits under such circumstances, participants are also allowed to cure their noncompliance by reporting to their caseworker and agreeing to cooperate. According to State and local administrators, this process may lead to abuse as participants avoid being sanctioned by agreeing to comply each time they are found to be noncompliant.

## IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe how the latitude given States in the design of their E&T services affected the types of work registrants selected to participate in the Program. The information used is derived from data collected from a nationally representative sample of about 13,000 individuals eligible to participate in E&T. A baseline information form was completed on each individual randomly selected for the evaluation study at the time of their application or recertification for food stamps benefits. This form obtained information on household characteristics such as household size and composition and types and amounts of income, and the characteristics of individuals required to participate in the E&T Program including education and prior work experience. Although these data were collected primarily to serve as a baseline from which to measure the effects of participation in the E&T Program, they also provide a snapshot of the types of individuals being served in FY1988.

### A. E&T PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

#### Demographic Characteristics

Exhibit IV.1 provides a description of the basic demographic characteristics (i.e., age, gender, marital status and ethnicity) of individuals participating in the E&T Program in FY1988.\* As shown, about 3 out of 5 E&T participants are between the ages of 22 and 40 years old -- the overall average is about 33 years. This is similar to the age distribution of all adult (aged 18 or older) food stamp recipients.\*\* However, the E&T participants are somewhat younger than the typical work registrants (the group from which E&T participants are drawn). About half of all work registrants are between the ages of 22 and 40.\*\*\*

Men and women are equally likely to be E&T participants. This is different than the general food stamp population where females account for nearly two-thirds of all recipients (FNS, 1988). But, this pattern is similar to the population of all work registrants -- about half of whom are male.

Slightly more than half of the E&T participants have never been married, and married individuals account for less than one-fifth of all E&T participants. Work registrants in general, however, are more likely to be married. This is the case for about two-fifths of all work registrants (IQCS, 1986).


---

\* Tables 12 through 14 in Appendix B provide statistics by the three service models and, for comparison purposes, for the population of all work registrants.


\*\* Food and Nutrition Service, USDA, Characteristics of Food Stamp Households: Summer 1986, 1988.

\*\*\* Data derived from the 1986 Integrated Quality Control System (IQCS). Characteristics have been estimated using recently certified or recertified individuals determined to be work registrants.


**Exhibit IV.1**  
**Demographic Characteristics of E&T Program Participants**  
**At Application/Recertification, FY1988**




Age



Gender



Marital Status



Ethnicity

SOURCE: Baseline interviews with sample of about 13,000 eligible E&T participants.

With regard to ethnicity, two out of every five E&T participants are White non-Hispanic, and about half are Black. Compared to the general food stamp population, E&T participants are far more likely to be minorities -- about one-third of all food stamp recipients are Black.\* E&T participants are also somewhat different from the pool of all work registrants, of which slightly more than half are White non-Hispanic.

### Household Size and Composition

Exhibit IV.2 presents information about the size and composition of E&T participant households. In line with the above discussion regarding marital status, E&T participants are overwhelmingly from single-person households. Slightly more than half are living in single-person households, nearly one-fourth in two-person households, and the remaining quarter live in households with three or more persons. This is far different from both the general food stamp population, where only about one-third of all recipients\*\* live in single-person households (FNS, 1988), and the population of all work registrants, of whom about one-fourth live in single-person households.

Participants residing in multiple-person households come from situations different from those found among the general food stamp population. Nine percent of the E&T participants are single females with one or more children at home, about 10 percent are from households comprising only two married adults, and 11 percent are from households with two married adults and one or more children (the remaining 17 percent reside in households not containing a married couple). In the general food stamp population, close to two-thirds of the recipient households have resident children, and over three-quarters of these households are headed by women (FNS, 1988).

E&T participants are also different from the average work registrant. About one-fourth of all work registrants live in single-person households, and almost half are in households with children (with either a married couple or a single female head). Households with children comprise only about one-fourth of the E&T households.

### Multiple E&T Participants


Although most households have only a single E&T participant, a substantial number (about 1 out of 6) have more than one person participating in the E&T Program. This is even more striking in light of the fact that more than half of the E&T participants live alone. For example, about half of all E&T households consisting of a married couple with dependent children have both parents participating in the Program.

---


\* U.S. Bureau of the Census, Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 1984 Research Panel, Wave 3.

\*\* If households containing elderly persons are excluded, single-person households account for about 21 percent of the total.


**Exhibit IV.2**  
**Size and Composition of E&T Participant Households**  
**at Time of Application/Recertification**



**Household Size**



**Number of E&T Participants in Household**



**Household Composition**

\* For example, unrelated adults.

SOURCE: Baseline interviews with sample of about 13,000 eligible E&T participants.

## Household Income

Approximately two-thirds of the E&T participants live in households with annual incomes under \$3,000; about four out of five have incomes less than \$6,000. Total gross monthly incomes for E&T participant households averaged \$287 in FY1988. This figure is about two-thirds of the household income of the typical food stamp recipient (gross household income averages \$417 per month -- FNS, 1988), and the typical work registrant whose income averages about \$425. This difference is largely due to the previously noted higher incidence of single-person households among the E&T participants (i.e., which have fewer sources of income).

As shown in Exhibit IV.3, about one-fifth of the E&T participant households reported wage earnings for the month prior to their FSP certification. Although this is comparable to the general food stamp population, the typical work registrant is more likely to reside in a household with wage income (about one-third have earnings), although the average monthly earnings are quite similar (about \$439).

With respect to unearned income, the proportion of E&T participant households receiving cash assistance (AFDC or GA) is, in the aggregate, similar to the receipt of such assistance by food stamp recipients -- about half receive either AFDC or GA (FNS, 1988). E&T participants are, however, about three times as likely as the average food stamp recipient to receive GA benefits (40% vs 12%) and about one-sixth as likely to receive AFDC (6% vs 38%). In general, the typical work registrant household is also much more likely than the average E&T household to be receiving AFDC (about 17% vs 6% for the E&T households), but much less likely to receive GA benefits (15% vs 40% for the E&T households).

## Educational Background

As shown in Exhibit IV.4, participants in the E&T Program are generally poorly educated, with more than half having failed to complete their high school education. This compares with about three-quarters of the adult population (over age 24) who have completed high school. This finding is, however, the same as that for the overall food stamp population, where slightly more than half of all recipients do not have a high school degree (SIPP, 1984). In the 1986 study of the food stamp job search demonstrations\*, the average years of schooling found for the work registrants was 10.5 years.

On the other end of the spectrum, E&T participants are also less likely than the typical food stamp recipient to have a post-high school degree. About three percent of food stamp recipients have such a degree (SIPP, 1988) compared with about one percent of E&T participants.


As a group, the E&T participants appear to lack the formal education needed to compete effectively for jobs in today's demanding labor

---

\* Brandeis University and Abt Associates, 1986, Op. Cit.

**Exhibit IV.3**  
**Income of E&T Participant Households,**  
**at Time of Application/Recertification, FY1988**


(Average Amount  
per Month for Those  
with Such Income)




SOURCE: Baseline interviews with sample of about 13,000 E&T eligible participants.

#### Exhibit IV.4

### Educational Background and Labor Market Experience of E&T Participants at Time of Application/Recertification, FY1988



**LABOR MARKET  
EXPERIENCE**



SOURCE: Baseline interviews with sample of about 13,000 eligible E&T participants.

market. On the positive side, about one-third of all E&T participants have received supplementary technical or vocational training outside of high school, which should increase their employability.

### Labor Market Experiences

With regard to employment, the E&T participants are also generally not well attached to the labor market. In the general population, close to three-quarters of all persons over the age of 16 years, are gainfully employed some time during a 12 month period.\* In contrast, only about half of the E&T participants reported having worked for pay at some time during the prior 12 months. Of those who worked, about half worked more than six months in the last year, and about one-third worked from 9 to 12 months. Similar labor activity was found in the previous job search demonstrations, where about 57 percent of the work registrants reported some work experience in the preceding 12 months.

When E&T participants did work in the last year, it was close to full time. On average, participants worked 30 hours per week when they were employed, at an average hourly pay of \$5.59.

At the time of entry into the Program, however, the E&T participants were generally not employed -- only about one in ten worked the week prior to application for food stamp benefits. This is slightly lower than the work status of all food stamp recipients, where about 14 percent of all household heads are employed. On average, the E&T participants who were employed worked about 18 hours per week.

### Participation By Volunteers

States planned for very low (less than 6%) participation by volunteers in the E&T Program. According to the data which were collected as part of this study, actual participation appears to be almost non-existent; less than one percent of the selected participants voluntarily entered the Program. However, it should be noted that volunteers are concentrated in a small number of States -- seven States account for about 95 percent of the total -- and some of those States (e.g., Massachusetts) are not part of the evaluation study.

The observed low participation by volunteers may be due to two factors. First, individuals may either not perceive any benefit to participation, or not know enough about the Program to spend the time and effort to obtain services. Second, caseworkers may not be actively seeking volunteers and, as a consequence, may not be presenting applicants with a description of their available options. The information currently available does not permit a determination of the extent to which either, or both, of these factors have affected individuals' choices; all that can be certain, is that the Program with a few exceptions, is not serving significant numbers of volunteers.

---

\* Ryscavage, Paul and Angela Feldman-Harkins, Work Experience Data From SIPP, SIPP Working Paper No. 8703, U.S. Bureau of the Census, April 1987.

## B. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN E&T PROGRAM SERVICES AND PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

This section examines the relationship between the characteristics of E&T Program participants and the types of services offered by local FSAs (detailed data can be found in Appendix B). Before presenting these data, however, it is important to note that reference is being made in this section to an analytical category of local agencies, and not to actual service components to which the participants have been assigned. Until outcome data are available on these participants, the degree to which services are actually being received, and which participants receive which services, is not known.

### Demographic Characteristics

There are important differences in the demographic characteristics of the E&T participants among the three service models. In general, participants in local Job Search model FSAs are most likely to be White married males, those in local Job Search Training model FSAs are most likely to be Black single females, and those in local Intensive Service model FSAs are most likely to be Black single females or female household-heads.

### Income

With regard to wages, the most striking finding is that participants in local Job Search model FSAs are, by far, the most likely to have come from households with earned income at the time of FSP certification (32% vs 12% and 19% in Job Search Training and Intensive Service FSAs respectively). Given that the intent of Job Search is to move the most employable participants into productive jobs, this finding seems to support the notion that this type of service is correctly targeted.

Comparing the income pattern of participant households across the three models, further reveals that E&T participation by public assistance recipients is related to the service configuration in place at the local FSA. For example, whereas less than 2 percent of Job Search model households receive GA, almost two-thirds of Job Search Training model households and about 40 percent of Intensive Service model households receive such assistance. With respect to AFDC, participant households in local Intensive Service model FSAs are most likely to receive such benefits (11% compared to 6% and 2% for Job Search and Job Search Training FSAs respectively).

It would appear, therefore, that States have opted to target certain E&T components to those mandatory work registrants who are GA recipients. And, where recipients of public assistance are targeted for E&T, this is most likely to occur in local FSAs offering services beyond simple job search. This is not unexpected. First, food stamp recipients are excluded from E&T if they are complying with AFDC work requirements (i.e., WIN). Because GA recipients are not similarly exempted, States appear to have used the E&T Program to provide job services to their GA clients. Second, States have a financial incentive to serve GA clients. To the extent that the Program is successful in assisting participants to find employment, a State's expenditures for GA assistance will be reduced.

Education  
and Labor  
Market  
Experiences

There are differences, albeit modest, in participants' educational attainment across the three service models. Participants in local Job Search Training model FSAs are both more likely to have failed to complete their high school education, and to have obtained supplementary vocational/technical training. Among the three categories of local FSAs, participants in this group are less likely to be prepared for the labor market.

With respect to employment, E&T participants in local Job Search Training model FSAs are more likely to be experiencing chronic unemployment. These participants are substantially less likely to have worked in the previous 12 months. At the time of certification for food stamp benefits, however, participants in local Intensive Services model FSAs were least likely to have been employed, or actively seeking employment, during the prior month.

### C. SUMMARY

States have targeted the E&T Program toward certain types of food stamp recipients:

- Most participants are relatively young (the average age is 33 years) and equally likely to be male or female.
- For the most part, E&T participants are single and unmarried. Slightly more than half of all participants have never been married and live alone.
- About 6 out of every 10 E&T participants are minorities.
- E&T participants are generally poorly educated -- only about half have completed high school -- but about one-third have obtained supplementary technical or vocational training.
- E&T participants are also not well attached to the labor market -- only about 4 out of 10 were gainfully employed during the past year. Of those who were employed, about half worked more than six months, and about one-third worked from 9-12 months. Average employment consisted of about 30 hours per week for an average of \$5.59 per hour, or only about \$168 per week.
- E&T participants in local Job Search model FSAs are most likely to be White married males residing in households with earned income. Because job search is intended to assist those most employable to find productive jobs, this finding appears to support a conclusion that the Program is being correctly targeted. But, until information is available on the actual services received (recall that FSAs in the other two categories also provide job search services), this conclusion must remain tentative.
- E&T participants in local Job Search Training model FSAs are most likely to be Black single female GA recipients.

- E&T participants in local Intensive Service model FSAs are most likely to be Black single females or female household-heads -- these individuals are also likely to be receiving GA but are most likely to be AFDC recipients.

In general, the E&T Program is serving food stamp recipients who are young, unmarried and non-White. These individuals, however, are in need of remedial services to compete in today's labor market. They typically lack formal education, and have been unable to maintain steady employment in the past.

States appear to have focused the E&T Program on those work registrants who are also GA recipients -- about 40 percent of all E&T participants receive GA benefits. Moreover, this representation is higher than the proportion of all work registrants who receive such assistance. This finding may be the result of two factors. First, unlike AFDC recipients GA recipients involved in another work program are not categorically exempted from E&T participation. Second, there is a clear incentive for States to provide job services to their GA population through the E&T Program. If the Program is successful in helping participants find employment, States can realize significant savings in welfare expenditures as these individuals become self-sufficient.

It is also notable that relatively few AFDC recipients are participating in the E&T Program. Only about 6 percent of the E&T participants receive AFDC benefits; and those who do are primarily in local Intensive Service model FSAs. The relatively low representation is due to the fact that AFDC recipients involved in Title IVA work programs (i.e., WIN) are exempt from the work registration. Those AFDC recipients who have been assigned to E&T may be individuals not covered under an existing WIN program. For example, the State may only provide services to AFDC households with both parents present. In such instances, the E&T Program may provide an opportunity for States to extend employment and training services to a portion of their AFDC caseload who have otherwise been excluded from such assistance. This also may account for the concentration of these participants in Intensive Service model FSAs (i.e., E&T may have been integrated with a pre-existing work program).

**APPENDIX A**  
**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON WORK PROGRAMS FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS**

## Introduction

Exhibit A.1 summarizes the last 20 years of research related to employment and training services for welfare recipients. Although these results largely deal with AFDC clients (who differ from food stamp recipients in important ways) many of the conclusions are relevant to the use of similar programs for food stamp recipients.

A review of this exhibit suggests four major themes. First, there are major variations in the range of services available to program participants. Several projects tested relatively minimal, low-cost services focused on job search and/or job search training. For example, the Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration tested variations in job search requirements. A second group of projects tested "up front" mandatory job search followed by another service or sequence of services for those who did not obtain employment. Examples of this type of program are the EOPP Demonstration and many of the recently evaluated WIN-Demonstration Programs. Some programs have also attempted to implement customized services based on individual assessments of a participant's needs and skills including, job search assistance and placement services, education and skills training services, work experience or subsidized employment opportunities and a variety of support services such as child care and transportation assistance. Notable examples are the Massachusetts ET Program, the AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstration and the Connecticut Supported Work Demonstration.

Another central program design feature is the nature of the obligation to participate. In 1971, WIN was changed to make participation mandatory for a significant portion of the AFDC population (usually the principal earner in AFDC-U families and AFDC family heads with no pre-school children). Since that time, several projects have tested the efficacy of enforcing that obligation. For example, the Minnesota Work Equity Demonstration Project attempted to enforce the participation requirement for WIN-mandatory recipients. In addition, the Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration provided for sanctions against noncompliant mandatory participants. Other projects have tested the concept of voluntary participation, including the EOPP Projects, the Supported Work Demonstration, The Massachusetts ET Program, and the New York State CEOSC Program.

A third design aspect is the scope of the caseload targeted for participation. That is, several projects (e.g., the California GAIN Program, EOPP and the Work Equity Demonstrations) attempted to test the feasibility of a "saturation" program in which all eligible (or mandatory) participants would receive some program service. Of the projects connected with the AFDC Program, the emphasis has been on serving mandatory WIN registrants while allowing (and even

Exhibit A.1

Major Welfare Reform and Employment and Training Programs

Program	Period of Study	Major Interventions Tested	Target Population
Negative Income Tax Experiments (New Jersey/Penn.; Iowa/N.C.; Gary, Ind.; Seattle/Denver)	1968-78	Guaranteed Minimum Family Income; varied taxes on earnings; voluntary employment counseling and subsidies for education and training	Low-income intact families; female-headed families
Work Incentive Program (WIN)	1968-	Mainstream work and training Program for AFDC recipients until 1981; still operating in many states and counties after 1981.	Mandatory for AFDC-U families and for most other AFDC families with no children under age of 6
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) Program	1973-83	Mainstream Federal Job Training Program for low-income individuals	Low-income individuals, including welfare recipients; dislocated workers; youth
National Supported Work Demonstration	1975-78	Guaranteed on-the-job training slot with salary for up to 18 months	Longer term AFDC recipients (30 out of previous 36 months) with children 6 years or older; ex-addicts; ex-offenders; at-risk youth
Louisville WIN Job Search Experiment	1978-80	Individual and group job search	AFDC recipients registered for WIN (both mandatory and voluntary registrants)
Denver WIN Services to Volunteers Project	1978-81	Active recruitment and enhanced services to WIN volunteers	AFDC recipients with children under age of 6

Exhibit A.1 (continued)

Program	Period of Study	Major Interventions Tested	Target Population
Massachusetts Work Experience Program	1978-79	Community work experience and mandatory job search; sanctions for non-compliant individuals	Principal earners in AFDC-U families from WIN unassigned pool
Minnesota Work Equity Program	1978-1981	Job search assistance for "job-ready" participants; variety of services for non job-ready, including community work experience, on-the-job or classroom training, additional vocational or support services; sanctions for noncompliant individuals	"Saturation" project designed to serve all WIN mandatories (and any volunteers) in selected areas; also served general assistance and food stamp recipients
Employment Opportunity Pilot Projects (EOPP)	1979-1981	Job search assistance (5-8 weeks) followed by subsidized employment or training for those not finding work	"Saturation" project; open to all AFDC recipients in test area
Food Stamp Workfare Demonstration	1979-80	Workfare (work at public sector work site at minimum wage for enough hours to equal food stamp benefit); sanctions for non-compliant individuals	Mandatory food stamp work registrants
Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration	1981-84	Various work registration and individual and group job search requirements; one variant included workfare after unsuccessful job search; sanctions for non-compliant individuals	Mandatory food stamp work registrants
AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstration	1983-86	Formal training as homemaker-home health aide followed by up to one year of subsidized employment	AFDC recipients who have not worked as home health aides for past 90 days

Exhibit A.1 (continued)

Program	Period of Study	Major Interventions Tested	Target Population
WIN-Demonstration Program Evaluations (San Diego; Baltimore; Arkansas; Cook County, Illinois; Virginia; West Virginia)	1983-87	San Diego, Arkansas, Virginia, Cook County: mandatory assisted job search followed by brief (3 months) workfare or work experience placement for some; West Virginia: workfare for duration of AFDC receipt; Baltimore: choice of job search, unpaid work experience, or education and training services	WIN Mandatory applicants and recipients (in Arkansas, this included families with children 3 years of age or older)
<u>Recent state Initiated Programs:</u>  Massachusetts Employment and Training (ET) Program	1983-	Voluntary Program featuring outreach and choice of Program services	AFDC recipients
Ohio Work Programs (five counties)	1983-1987	Major intervention is "workfare," or placement into community service jobs as condition for eligibility for benefits; job search and placement services, education and training services also available	Mandatory WIN registrants; GR recipients
New York State Comprehensive Employment Opportunity Support Centers (CEOSC)	1987-	Intensive education, training, job placement, support and counseling services	Single AFDC, family heads with pre-school child(ren)

Exhibit A.1 (continued)

Program	Period of Study	Major Interventions Tested	Target Population
Maryland Investment in Job Opportunity (IJO) Program	1987-	Customized education, training, job placement, support and counseling services; Program services delivered jointly by county welfare agency, employment and training agency and economic development agency	Available to all AFDC recipients; longer term recipients and teenage mothers are special target groups
Connecticut Supported Work Program	1985-	Enhanced on-the-job training; AFDC grant diverted into subsidized wage	AFDC recipients
Pennsylvania Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Program and Program for the Transitionally Needy (TN)	1987-	SPOC: Comprehensive customized services including assessment, individual employability plans, basic education, skills training, work experience, job development and placement services TN: Primarily job placement services	SPOC: AFDC mothers with children under 6 years old; AFDC mothers on welfare for two years or more; individuals with reading level below 6th grade; individuals with limited English-speaking ability TN: Employable General Assistance recipients
California Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program	1987-	Comprehensive range of services, including job search assistance, adult basic education, career assessment, vocational education and training, OJT, supported work, work experience, support services; goal of full and continuous participation for mandatory participants; customized services	AFDC WIN-mandatory population; volunteers

Exhibit A.1 (continued)

Program	Period of Study	Major Interventions Tested	Target Population
<u>Recent National Program Evaluations:</u>  Evaluation of Job Training Partnership Act Programs (JTPA)	1987-	Programs funded under Title IIA of JTPA	Low-income individuals, including AFDC recipients
Evaluation of the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program	1988-	Three Program models: Job Search; Job Search Training; Job Search with more intensive education and training services	Mandatory food stamp work registrants and volunteers

encouraging) WIN volunteers. This is true, for example, of the WIN Program itself, the Louisville WIN Job Search Experiment, the Minnesota Work Equity Project, and many of the WIN-Demonstration Projects. Some projects have sought to attract any AFDC client regardless of WIN status. These variations include the EOPP Demonstration, the Massachusetts ET Program, and the Connecticut Supported Work Program. Some projects have been aimed at WIN volunteers only, such as the Denver WIN Services to Volunteers Project or the New York CEOSC Project. Other programs have attempted to target their resources on AFDC recipients considered to be more at risk of being "long-term" welfare recipients. Although the precise definition of the targeted group has been different in each case, the programs serving these longer-term or at-risk welfare recipients include the National Supported Work Demonstration, the Pennsylvania SPOC Program and the Maryland IJO Program.

**Findings on  
Program  
Implementation  
and Operations**

Past evaluations of employment and training programs have yielded a wide variety of findings about barriers to successful program implementation and administration, and recommendations about effective and efficient program operation. The following are the more commonly reported themes:

- Coordination of services and communication between agencies or between units in the same agency is crucial to the success of employment and training programs. Too often clients "fall into the cracks" between program components or agencies simply because of poor coordination.
- Adequate and appropriate support services are crucial features of successful programs — for example, the provision of additional child care resources is often critical.
- Efficient and accurate information systems are needed to monitor the progress of participants in the program and to assess the program's effectiveness in moving recipients out of welfare and into jobs.
- Effective participant monitoring and good case management can reduce program attrition.
- Performance-based contracting with other agencies (such as JTPA) can be used effectively to maximize agency performance for welfare recipients.
- Income maintenance staff often require some training in employment counseling and on the range of services available to participants, even if the agency has a separate employment unit.

**Findings on  
Participation  
Levels**

Although the level of participation in the various programs has been found to vary, it is rarely higher than 50 percent of those affected, even where participation is supposed to be mandatory. One reason for low participation may simply be lack of available program or support services. This is sometimes the case in programs that have multiple service choices for which interested participants may have

to wait for open slots. Other reasons are simply noncompliance with participation requirements, administrative inefficiency, and the lack of followup on the part of program management and staff.

Another common finding about participation patterns is the winnowing effect found in programs that have sequenced components, such as registration, assessment, job search, etc. It is often true in those programs that participation drops off between (or in the middle of) program components. Sometimes this is the result of individuals leaving the welfare rolls in the midst of the program. Often, it is a symptom of participants' casual attachment to, or lack of interest in, the program.

Research has also addressed the degree to which noncompliant behavior results in sanctioning by program staff. A common criticism of the WIN Program was the apparent lack of such enforcement. But, a review of the literature also reveals that the lack of enforcement of sanctioning provisions has been true of demonstration programs. The one notable exception to this general finding is the evaluation of the WIN-Demonstration Programs. There, researchers found that, in general, the implementation of programs with compulsory participation requirements was feasible. The key point appears to be that sanctions can be incorporated into work programs, but they will only be used if there is administrative commitment to them.

#### Findings on Program Impacts on Participant Employment and Earnings

A major goal of all of the cited employment and training projects was to increase participants' economic self-sufficiency through employment. How they intended to achieve this goal, however, varied in important ways.

The first program type is one that emphasizes relatively short-term, inexpensive services, usually job search or job search training. The Louisville WIN Job Search Experiment found that individual and group job search training had a small but positive effect on employment and earnings over the five quarters following random assignment into treatment and control groups. Similarly, the Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration found a small but positive effect on employment and earnings during the entire followup period of 25 weeks after random assignment.

A second group of program models tested the impact of applicant job search and some other activity after unsuccessful job search. For the most part, these evaluations also found small but positive impacts on the employment and earnings of program participants. For example, participation in the EOPP Program was estimated to increase the hours worked per month by single female AFDC heads by about 4.5 hours by the 8th quarter following program entry; earnings also increased slightly. The recently evaluated WIN-Demonstration Programs that used a similar program model design (job search followed by some other activity) found some positive impacts from program participation. The programs operated in San Diego and Arkansas resulted in increases in both employment and earnings, while the Virginia participants experienced an increase in employment only. The experiment in Cook County showed no statistically significant impacts at all.

Another group of programs tested the impact of tailored programs in which participants have some choice over the service or services provided. An early study of the WIN Program detected positive effects on both the employment and earnings of participants.

Although estimates of impacts from CETA vary greatly among the many studies that have been conducted, in general most studies have found positive effects on the employment and earnings of female

Program in Baltimore, a WIN-Demonstration Program that offered a range of service choices to mandatory WIN registrants, was found to have small but positive impacts on participant employment and earnings during the followup period.

A final group of evaluations tested a specialized program model delivering a unique service. For example, the National Supported Work Demonstration tested the impact of an on-the-job training program featuring increasing levels of responsibility in a subsidized work slot. Results from this project indicated positive impacts on both employment and earnings of participants. Moreover, these impacts lasted well after the subsidized job was over, or up to 27 weeks after program enrollment. The Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstration tested the combination of specialized skills training and a subsidized job on welfare recipients. Here, the effects were mixed, with some sites yielding positive impacts on participant employment and earnings, and other sites experiencing net losses or no effects.

In summary, these various results indicate that employment and training programs for welfare recipients can produce measurable, positive impacts. For the most part, however, these impacts have been relatively modest, rarely exceeding, for example, a 10 percent-

Findings on  
Program Impacts  
on the Receipt  
of Welfare

not show itself until that participant is ready and able to look for and obtain employment; in fact, the impact in the very short term may be negative. A second pattern evident in prior evaluations is the gradual washing out of effects over time. In most of the programs reviewed here the impact of the program (once it showed itself) decreased with time after enrollment.

As with the effect on the employment and earnings of the participants, some programs have had an impact on the receipt and level of welfare benefits. Curiously, however, some of the programs that had impacts on employment and earnings did not produce impacts on the receipt of public assistance; moreover, the impacts, if any, were usually smaller in magnitude than employment and earnings effects.

**AFDC Benefits.** The EOPP Demonstration, which found small but positive effects on employment and earnings, found no discernible impacts on the receipt of AFDC by single female family heads. More recently, the evaluation of the WIN-Demonstration Projects found impacts on AFDC receipt in fewer sites for which there were measurable impacts on employment and earnings. In the National Supported Work Demonstration, while the average increase in monthly earnings by the 25th-27th month after Program entry for participants was about \$80, the average decrease in monthly welfare income (including food stamp bonus value) for the same period was about \$55. Finally, in some instances, while no detectable effects on the incidence of AFDC were found, there were measurable effects on the amount of the AFDC grant received. For example, this was the case in the WIN-Demonstration Projects in San Diego, Cook County and Virginia; in Arkansas the magnitude of the effect was much greater on the amount of the AFDC grant than on the incidence of AFDC receipt.

These effects are related both to AFDC Program regulations and the behavior of AFDC recipients. With regard to the former, in many instances gaining employment does not disqualify a person from receiving AFDC, and the reduction in the AFDC grant will be smaller than the gain in earnings. First, eligibility requirements allow AFDC recipients to earn up to a certain percentage of the State's standard of need (185% is the first cutoff) before losing eligibility. This helps explain why increases in employment and earnings may not affect the incidence of AFDC receipt (for example, if the increase in employment is all due to part-time jobs). Second, in an effort to increase the incentive for AFDC recipients to seek and accept work, AFDC regulations do not impose a 100 percent tax on the earnings of AFDC recipients.

With regard to the recipient's behavior, welfare recipients leave the rolls (and return) for a variety of reasons; employment is but one among many factors that influence welfare dependency. For example, many single AFDC family heads leave the rolls to marry (thereby increasing family income); some recipients simply "age out" of eligibility when their youngest child reaches the cutoff age for AFDC eligibility. The result of these patterns of welfare use is that the

portion of individuals who leave welfare is much larger than the proportion that leave welfare due to employment. Therefore, while a training program may have a detectable effect on employment, the resulting effect on welfare receipt may be proportionately smaller because the employment effect on welfare receipt gets spread out over a larger group.

**Other Cash and In-kind Assistance Programs.** Findings on the impact of employment and training programs on the receipt of other forms of assistance are less available than findings related to AFDC. Nevertheless, the few evaluations reveal patterns similar to that of AFDC especially the results of the Food Stamp Job Search evaluation (described earlier). An interesting finding from the National Supported Work Program is that unemployment insurance payments increased for program participants. This effect is probably due to participants being given a guaranteed job. As participants dropped out of the program, or were fired from the Supported Work job placement, they collected unemployment insurance in greater amounts than did the control group.

#### **Findings on Program Costs**

Prior demonstration projects have reported widely varying cost per participant. In large part, of course, the variation in program costs is directly tied to the intensity and duration of the services provided. Nevertheless, the record of past Program costs allows some insight into the likely costs of operating similar programs. For example, job search and job club participant costs elsewhere have been relatively modest, usually no more than \$100 per participant. On the other hand, subsidized employment, even when partly funded by grant diversion, has been relatively costly. The San Diego WIN-Demonstration project had a Community Work Experience component which cost about \$640 per participant. In the Massachusetts ET Program (in which approximately 40 percent of participants use job search and placement services, and the remaining 60 percent receive more expensive education, skills training and supported work services), the average cost per participant in 1986 was \$1,257.

## REFERENCES

- Bane, Mary Jo, and David T. Ellwood (1983). "The Dynamics of Dependence: The Routes to Self-Sufficiency." Cambridge, MA: Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc.
- Bane, Mary Jo (1986). "Household Composition and Poverty." Fighting Poverty: What Works and What Doesn't. Edited by Sheldon H. Danziger and Daniel H. Weinberg. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnow, Burt (1987). "The Impact of CETA Programs on Earnings: A Review of the Literature." Journal of Human Resources. 22(2): 157-193.
- Bassi, Laurie J., Margaret C. Simms, Lynn C. Burbidge, and Charles L. Betsey (1984). "Measuring the Effect of CETA on Youth and the Economically Disadvantaged." Final Report prepared for the U.S. DOL under Contract No. 20-11-82-19. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Brandeis University, The Center for Human Resources, and Abt Associates Inc. (1986). Food Stamp Work Registration and Job Search Demonstration. Final Report prepared for U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, under contract No. 53-33198-0-85. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University.
- Burtless, Gary, and Larry L. Orr (1986). "Are Classical Experiments Needed for Manpower Policy?" Journal of Human Resources. 21(4):606-39.
- Ellwood, David T. (1986). "Targeting 'Would-Be' Long-Term Recipients of AFDC." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Fraker, Thomas and Rebecca Maynard (1987). "Evaluating Comparison Group Designs with Employment-Related Programs." Journal of Human Resources. 22(2): 194-227.
- Friedlander, Daniel, Gregory Hoerz, David Long, Janet Quint (1985a). Maryland: Final Report on the Employment Initiatives Evaluation. New York: MDRC.
- Friedlander et al. (1985b). Arkansas: Final Report on the WORK Program in Two Counties. New York: MDRC.
- Frees, J.W., Charles S. Rodgers, Jane Kulik, Danny Steinberg, Ernst W. Stromsdorfer, Daniel Sullivan (1982). Final Report on the Minnesota Work Equity Project: Key Findings From the Demonstration. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc.
- General Accounting Office (1982). An Overview of the WIN Program: Its Objectives, Accomplishments, and Problems.
- General Accounting Office (1988). Work and Welfare: Analysis of AFDC Employment Programs in Four States.

## REFERENCES

(continued)

- General Accounting Office (1987). Work and Welfare: Current AFDC Work Programs and Implications for Federal Policy.
- Ginzberg, Eli, and Board of Directors (1980). Summary and Findings of the National Supported Work Demonstration. New York: MDRC.
- Goldman, Barbara S. (1981). Impacts of the Immediate Job Search Assistance Experiment: Louisville WIN Research Laboratory Project. New York: MDRC.
- Goldman, Barbara S., Daniel Friedlander, David Long (1986). Final Report on the San Diego Job Search and Work Experience Demonstrations. New York: MDRC.
- Gueron, Judith M. (1986). Work Initiatives for Welfare Recipients: Lessons From a Multi-State Experiment. New York: MDRC.
- Gueron, Judith M. (1988). "State Welfare Employment Initiatives: Lessons From the 1980s." In Focus. Volume II, Number 1, Spring 1988.
- Heckman, James J., and Richard Robb, Jr. (1985). "Alternative Methods for Evaluating the Impact of Interventions." In Longitudinal Analysis of Labor Market Data, ed. J. Heckman and B. Singer. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heckman, J. and V.J. Hotz (1987). "On the Use of Nonexperimental Methods for Estimating the Impact of Manpower Training Programs: Re-Evaluating the Evaluations." Unpublished Manuscript.
- Kemper, Peter, David Long, and Craig Thornton (1981). The Supported Work Evaluation: Final Benefit-Cost Analysis. Volume 5 of the Final Report. New York: MDRC.
- LaLonde, Robert J. (1984). "Evaluating the Econometric Evaluations of Training Programs with Experimental Data." Working Paper No. 183. Industrial Relations Section. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- LaLonde, R. and R. Maynard (1987). "How Precise are Evaluations of Employment and Training Programs: Evidence from a Field Experiment." Forthcoming.
- Maryland Department of Human Resources, Office of Welfare Employment Policy (1984). A Study of Barriers to Employment for WIN Mandatory Welfare Recipients.
- Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare (1987). An Evaluation of the Massachusetts Employment and Training Choices Program: Interim Findings on Participation and Outcomes.
- Masters, Stanley H. and Rebecca Maynard (1981). The Impact of Supported Work on Long-Term Recipients of AFDC Benefits. Volume 3 of the Final Report on the Supported Work Evaluation. New York: MDRC.

## REFERENCES

(continued)

- Mead, Lawrence (1986). Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship. New York: The Free Press.
- Mitchell, John T., Mark Chadwin, and Demetra Nightingale (1979). Implementing Welfare-Employment Programs: An Institutional Analysis of the Work Incentive (WIN) Program. Prepared for U.S. DOL under research and development grant No. 51-11-77-01. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Moffitt, Robert A. (1982). "The Effect of a Negative Income Tax on Work Effort: A Summary of the Experimental Results." Welfare Reform in America. Edited by Paul M. Sommers. Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Nightingale, Demetra S. and Lynn C. Burbridge (1987). The Status of State Work-Welfare Programs in 1986: Implications for Welfare Reform. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- O'Neill, June A., Douglas A. Wolf, Laurie J. Bassi, and Michael T. Hannan (1984). An Analysis of Time on Welfare. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Orr, Larry L. (1986). AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstrations: Benefits and Costs. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc.
- Pacific Consultants with Camil Associates and Ketron, Inc. (1976). The Impact of WIN II: A Longitudinal Evaluation. Prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service under Contract No. 53-3-013-06. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Consultants.
- Pechman, Joseph A., and P. Michael Timpane, ed. (1975). Work Incentives and Income Guarantees. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Ritter, Martha and Sandra K. Danziger (1983). After Supported Work: Post-Program Interviews with a Sample of AFDC Participants. New York: MDRC.
- Robins, Philip K. and Richard West (1980). "Program Participation and Labor-Supply Response." Journal of Human Resources. 15(4): 499-523.
- Rodgers, Charles S. (1981). "Work Tests for Welfare Recipients: The Gap between the Goal and the Reality." Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. 1(1): 5-17.
- Schiller, Bradley (1988). Impact of the Work Programs: A Long-Term Perspective. Prepared for State of Ohio Department of Human Services Bureau of Work and Training, January 1988.
- Schiller, Bradley (1985). The Ohio Work Programs: Assessing the First Two Years. Prepared for the Ohio Department of Human Services Bureau of Work and Training, October, 1985.

## REFERENCES

(continued)

- Slaughter, Ellen L., Paulette Turshak, Gale Whiteneck, and Edward Baumheier (1981). Final Report on WIN Services to Volunteers: Denver WIN Research Laboratory Project. New York: MDRC.
- Wallace, John and Long, David with Karin Martinson (1987). The Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program: Planning and Early Implementation. New York: MDRC.
- Werner, Alan (1986). "Coordinating New Employment and Training Programs for Food Stamp Recipients." Prepared for the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, June 30, 1986.
- Werner, Alan, Christopher Kane, Gary Silverstein and Jean Layzer (1988). Review of the Implementation of the Maryland Investment in Job Opportunities Program: Synthesis of Findings. Prepared for New York Department of Social Services, Office of Program Planning, Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc.
- Werner, Alan and Bonnie Nutt-Powell (1988). Evaluation of the Implementation of the New York State Comprehensive Employment Opportunity Support Centers: Volume I: Synthesis of Findings. Prepared for Maryland Department of Human Resources, Office of Welfare Employment Policy. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc.
- Wilson, William Julius and Kathryn M. Neckerman (1986). "Poverty and Family Structure: The Widening Gap Between Evidence and Public Policy Issues." Fighting Poverty: What Works and What Doesn't. Edited by Sheldon H. Danziger and Daniel H. Weinberg. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

**APPENDIX B**  
**DETAILED STATISTICAL TABLES**

**Table 1**  
**E&T Program Services Planned by the States, FY1988**

State	Job Search	Job Search Training	Workfare	Work Experience	Education	Vocational Training	Other*
Alabama	X	X		X	X	X	
Alaska	X	X				X	X
Arizona	X	X					
Arkansas	X	X		X	X	X	X
California	X	X		X		X	
Colorado	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Connecticut	X	X			X		
Delaware	X	X			X	X	X
District of Columbia	X	X			X		
Florida	X	X			X		X
Georgia	X	X			X	X	
Hawaii	X	X			X		
Idaho	X	X	X				
Illinois	X	X		X	X	X	
Indiana		X		X	X	X	
Iowa	X						X
Kansas	X	X		X	X	X	X
Kentucky	X						
Louisiana	X	X					
Maine		X			X		X
Maryland	X	X			X	X	
Massachusetts	X	X		X	X	X	X
Michigan	X	X		X	X	X	X
Minnesota	X				X	X	X
Mississippi	X		X				

Table 1 (cont.)

State	Job Search	Job Search Training	Workfare	Work Experience	Education	Vocational Training	Other*
Missouri	X						
Montana	X	X	X		X		
Nebraska		X					
Nevada	X	X				X	
New Hampshire	X						
New Jersey	X	X			X	X	
New Mexico	X	X	X	X	X	X	
New York	X	X			X	X	
North Carolina	X				X		X
North Dakota		X			X	X	X
Ohio	X	X		X	X	X	
Oklahoma	X						
Oregon	X	X				X	
Pennsylvania	X	X	X		X	X	
Rhode Island	X	X			X	X	X
South Carolina	X	X			X	X	X
South Dakota	X	X					
Tennessee	X	X			X	X	
Texas	X						X
Utah	X	X			X	X	
Vermont	X	X		X	X	X	
Virginia	X	X	X		X	X	
Washington	X	X				X	X
West Virginia	X					X	X
Wisconsin	X		X	X	X	X	
Wyoming	X			X	X	X	
Guam	X					X	
Virgin Islands	X						

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program plans.

\* Includes: on-the-job training, supported employment, vocational rehabilitation, and home-based employment.

**Table 2**  
**Planned E&T Program Participation by State and Service Model, FY1988**

Program Model*	State	Planned Participant Slots for:**		
		Job Search	Job Search Training	Intensive*** Services
Model 1: Job Search	Alabama	3,800	1,800	3,850
	Alaska	4,000	100	60
	California	127,888	21,957	9,080
	Iowa	29,772	10,535	0
	Kentucky	22,800	0	1,200
	Missouri	19,537	1,000	500
	Nevada	6,889	840	271
	New Hampshire	900	0	0
	North Carolina	9,148	0	0
	Oklahoma	20,167	0	0
	Texas	293,652	0	4,814
	West Virginia	26,000	0	465
	Virgin Islands	607	0	80
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>565,160</b>	<b>36,232</b>	<b>20,320</b>
Model 2: Job Search Training	Arizona	3,700	1,900	0
	District of Columbia	1,100	1,200	225
	Georgia	12,600	12,600	2,000
	Idaho	1,645	1,782	318
	Louisiana		26,373	0
	Maryland	1,565	8,218	0
	Montana	5,460	3,894	0
	Nebraska		13,035	0
	New Jersey	9,662	1,610	1,600
	New York	45,000	20,000	1,500
	North Dakota		2,870	134
	Oregon	23,530	2,069	259
	South Dakota	5,113	5,113	0
	Vermont	585	585	1,170
	Washington	9,399	1,250	600
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>119,359</b>	<b>102,499</b>	<b>7,806</b>

\* Where States planned for more than one program model, classification was done according to the model that was intended to serve the largest number of participants.

\*\* A participant slot is a budgeted slot for a given service; one individual may participate in more than one slot in either the same or different services.

\*\*\* Includes work experience, workfare, vocational training, and educational services.

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program plans.

**Table 2 (cont.)**

Program Model*	State	Planned Participant Slots for:**		
		Job Search	Job Search Training	Intensive*** Services
Model 3: Intensive Services	Arkansas	5,200	13,000	14,330
	Colorado	22,529	4,502	3,727
	Connecticut	57	172	919
	Delaware	0	700	1,000
	Florida	32,317	4,683	32,317
	Hawaii	1,680	750	1,070
	Illinois	0	73,273	117,454
	Indiana	0	5,000	12,550
	Kansas	165	141	247
	Maine	0	983	492
	Massachusetts	6,000	2,750	14,980
	Michigan	3,066	2,594	13,208
	Minnesota	29,790	0	6,200
	Mississippi	8,482	0	2,352
	New Mexico	10,180	3,779	4,838
	Ohio	4,950	36	37,460
	Pennsylvania	39,420	24,638	8,934
	Rhode Island	70	70	248
	South Carolina	9,975	520	3,335
	Tennessee	18,826	0	10,191
	Utah	0	2,600	2,100
	Virginia	11,684	4,769	1,508
	Wisconsin	31,491	0	13,694
	Wyoming	1,970	600	440
	Guam	680	0	170
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>238,532</b>	<b>145,560</b>	<b>303,764</b>

\* Where States planned for more than one program model, classification was done according to the model that was intended to serve the largest number of participants.

\*\* A participant slot is a budgeted slot for a given service; one individual may participate in more than one slot in either the same or different services.

\*\*\* Includes work experience, workfare, vocational training, and educational services.

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program plans.

**Table 3**  
**Percent of Counties with E&T Program in FY1988**  
**Compared with Percent of Counties with Job Search Program in FY1986, by State.**

State	% Counties Within State FS Job Search FY1986	% Counties Within State E & T Program FY1988	Percentage Point Difference (FY88-FY86)	State	% Counties Within State FS Job Search FY1986	% Counties Within State E & T Program FY1988	Percentage Point Difference (FY88-FY86)
Alabama	18	13	-5	Nebraska	1	26	25
Alaska	17	50	33	Nevada	25	24	-1
Arizona	21	27	6	New Hampshire	50	100	50
Arkansas	24	61	37	New Jersey	100	100	0
California	16	59	43	New Mexico	100	55	-45
Colorado	6	40	34	New York	55	100	45
Connecticut	*	100	100	North Carolina	57	78	21
Delaware	100	100	0	North Dakota	13	74	61
District of Columbia	*	100	100	Ohio	*	100	100
Florida	71	19	-52	Oklahoma	*	31	31
Georgia	4	12	8	Oregon	28	33	5
Hawaii	25	25	0	Pennsylvania	41	100	59
Idaho	14	7	-7	Rhode Island	*	100	100
Illinois	1	100	99	South Carolina	*	63	63
Indiana	*	21	21	South Dakota	19	24	5
Iowa	100	89	-11	Tennessee	36	42	6
Kansas	5	100	95	Texas	11	12	1
Kentucky	3	4	1	Utah	14	38	24
Louisiana	*	13	13	Vermont	*	14	14
Maine	75	100	25	Virginia	22	23	1
Maryland	*	88	88	Washington	100	62	-38
Massachusetts	*	100	100	West Virginia	49	100	51
Michigan	*	75	75	Wisconsin	11	43	32
Minnesota	28	100	72	Wyoming	*	52	52
Mississippi	8	20	12	Guam	*	100	100
Missouri	100	100	0	Virgin Islands	*	100	100
Montana	11	23	12				

\* State did not have FS Job Search Program in FY1986.

SOURCES: FY1986 data from Food Stamp Program Operations Study: Report on the Census of State Operations: Job Search, Abt Associates, 1987. FY1988 data from State E&T Program Plans.

**Table 4**  
**Comparison of New E&T Program to Previously Existing**  
**Food Stamp Job Search Program**

	Percent of Local FSAs by Model			
	Model 1: Job Search	Model 2: Job Search Training	Model 3: Intensive Services	All Models
Local FSAs had Job Search Program				
Similar to New E&T Program	43%	21%	23%	28%
Different from New E&T Program	36	11	11	12
No Prior Job Search Program – (E&T is new service)	21	68	76	60

SOURCE: Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

**Table 5**  
**Local FSA Integration and Coordination of the**  
**E&T Program with Other Agencies and Programs, FY1988**

	Percent of Local FSAs			
	All Models	Model 1: Job Search	Model 2: Job Search Training	Model 3: Intensive Service
<u>Type of Linkage with other Agencies</u>				
Integrated	70	77	37	81
Coordinated	22	16	37	19
Independent	8	7	26	0
<u>Type of Agency Used*</u>				
JTPA	72	64	50	85
Education	66	56	62	73
SESA	61	53	31	76
Community Based Organization	38	28	12	54
Other Agency**	35	37	26	37
Private Contractor	29	14	37	32
GA	18	0	3	32
WIN/WIN Demonstration	13	25	3	12

SOURCE: Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

\* More than one other agency may be used by a given local FSA.

\*\* Includes Job Corps, Community Action Agencies, Salvation Army, migrant worker organizations and the military.

**Table 6**  
**Administrative Responsibility for the Provision of E&T Program Services, FY1988**

Percent of Local FSAs				
	Model 1: Job Search	Model 2: Job Search Training	Model 3: Intensive Services	TOTAL
Administered by Local FSA				
• Eligibility Worker	1	26	0	6
• Separate Employment Unit	57	37	16	31
Administered by				
Comprehensive Program	0	0	34	18
Outside Contractor	42	36	17	28
Comprehensive Program and Outside Contractor	0	1	11	6
Local FSA and Outside Contractor	0	0	22	11

SOURCE: Inventory of Program Operations in national sample of 55 local FSAs.

**Table 7**  
**State Exemption and Targeting Policy**  
**For Mandatory Work Registrants, FY1988**

Exemption Criteria for Mandatory Work Registrants							Targeting Policy		
Categorical			Individual					PA Applicant Household	
30 Day Option	Other*	None	Child Care	Transpor- tation	Temporary Health Problem	Other**	None		

PRIMARY SERVICE MODEL

Table 7 (cont.)

Exemption Criteria for Mandatory Work Registrants							Targeting Policy			
Categorical				Individual					PA Applicant Household	
30 Day Option	Other*	None	Child Care	Transpor- tation	Temporary Health Problem	Other**	None			
<u>Model 3: Intensive Services</u>										
Arkansas		X	X	X	X				X	
Colorado		X		X	X		X		X	
Connecticut		X		X	X		X		X	
Delaware		X		X	X		X			X
Florida		X								
Hawaii		X				X	X		X	
Illinois			X			X	X			
Indiana		X		X					X	
Kansas		X		X		X	X		X	
Maine		X		X		X	X		X	
Massachusetts			X	X		X	X		X	
Michigan		X						X		X
Minnesota			X			X				X
Mississippi		X		X		X	X			
New Mexico		X		X		X			X	
Ohio		X		X		X			X	
Pennsylvania			X	X		X	X		X	
Rhode Island	X	X		X		X	X			X
South Carolina		X		X		X			X	
Tennessee		X		X		X	X		X	
Utah		X		X			X			X
Virginia		X		X		X	X			
Wisconsin		X						X	X	
Wyoming		X		X		X	X		X	
Guam			X			X	X			

**Table 8**  
**Planned E&T Program Exemption Patterns and Participation Levels FY1988**

Program Model	State	Work Registrants	Non-exempt Work Registrants	Non-exempt Participants	Non-exempt Participants as % of Non-exempt Work Registrants	Volunteers	Volunteers as Percent of Total Participants	Total Participants
Model 1: Job Search	Alabama	72,000	47,000	29,000	62 %	3,000	9 %	32,000
	Alaska	8,910	4,232	3,918	93	80	2	3,998
	California	311,229	211,722	163,560	77	683	0	164,243
	Iowa	45,804	43,348	43,348	100	0	0	43,348
	Kentucky	167,017	114,745	35,064	31	0	0	35,064
	Missouri	99,676	66,783	21,037	32	0	0	21,037
	Nevada	25,124	22,038	7,736	35	264	3	8,000
	New Hampshire	1,025	900	750	83	150	17	900
	North Carolina	37,770	25,004	24,712	99	292	1	25,004
	Oklahoma	34,016	20,167	20,167	100	500	2	20,667
	Texas	481,397	288,907	NA	NA	NA	NA	283,438
	West Virginia	31,500	26,550	26,550	100	300	1	26,850
	Virgin Islands	687	687	687	100	0	0	687
	Subtotals, Model 1	1,316,155	872,083	376,529 *	43 %*	5,269 *	1 %*	665,236
Model 2: Job Search Training	Arizona	16,110	12,700	5,600	44 %	0	0 %	5,600
	District of Columbia	7,200	5,760	2,520	44	225	8	2,745
	Georgia	70,652	46,371	21,336	46	0	0	21,336
	Idaho	9,156	5,916	3,960	67	0	0	3,960
	Louisiana	115,443	23,089	23,089	100	3,250	12	26,339
	Maryland	27,954	22,368	9,783	44	0	0	9,783
	Montana	38,181	24,634	9,354	38	0	0	9,354
	Nebraska	20,240	13,035	13,035	100	0	0	13,035
	New Jersey	16,104	12,872	11,272	88	1,600	12	12,872
	New York	138,000	103,200	46,128	45	372	1	46,500
	North Dakota	6,675	5,212	4,951	95	261	5	5,212
	Oregon	60,204	41,524	25,689	62	168	1	25,857
	South Dakota	12,782	7,082	4,515	64	0	0	4,515
	Vermont	7,000	5,950	950	16	1,500	61	2,450
	Washington	31,950	28,123	10,649	38	610	5	11,259
	Subtotals, Model 2	577,651	357,836	192,831	54 %	7,986	4 %	200,817

\* Excluding Texas  
NA= Not Available

Table 8 (cont.)

Program Model	State	Work Registrants	Non-exempt Work Registrants	Non-exempt Participants	Non-exempt Participants as % of Non-exempt Work Registrants	Volunteers	Volunteers as Percent of Total Participants	Total Participants
Model 3: Intensive Services	Arkansas	54,500	43,300	16,555	38 %	0	0 %	16,555
	Colorado	63,641	43,641	15,274	35	500	3	15,774
	Connecticut	1,148	1,033	1,033	100	115	10	1,148
	Delaware	2,412	1,688	1,350	80	338	20	1,688
	Florida	93,672	82,442	36,228	44	0	0	36,228
	Hawaii	10,639	5,307	3,300	62	200	6	3,500
	Illinois	207,203	204,203	159,414	78	31,407	17	190,821
	Indiana	80,000	60,000	17,550	29	0	0	17,550
	Kansas	22,469	16,948	16,584	98	200	1	16,784
	Maine	6,532	3,571	2,740	77	1,000	27	3,740
	Massachusetts	16,320	13,320	3,500	26	20,230	85	23,730
	Michigan	213,590	154,331	154,331	100	1,000	1	155,331
	Minnesota	50,340	45,809	29,130	64	600	2	29,730
	Mississippi	44,164	28,706	16,048	56	0	0	16,048
	New Mexico	23,832	18,797	16,797	89	2,000	11	18,797
	Ohio	173,100	138,480	42,410	31	0	0	42,410
	Pennsylvania	108,300	98,550	68,063	69	4,929	7	72,992
	Rhode Island	1,500	975	350	36	50	13	400
	South Carolina	30,756	23,042	22,264	97	1,172	5	23,436
	Tennessee	67,488	46,457	30,618	66	2,078	6	32,696
	Utah	12,180	8,051	2,550	32	1,400	34	4,100
	Virginia	38,641	36,323	11,087	31	835	7	11,922
	Wisconsin	44,988	31,941	31,781	99	160	1	31,941
	Wyoming	7,128	6,319	1,000	16	0	0	1,000
	Guam	1,680	1,380	850	62	0	0	850
Subtotals, Model 3		1,376,223	1,114,614	700,807	63 %	68,214	9 %	769,171
Totals		3,270,029	2,344,533	1,270,167 *	54 %*	81,469 *	5 %*	1,635,224

\* Excluding Texas

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&amp;T Program plans.

**Table 9**  
**E&T Program Planned Funding Levels FY1988**

Program Model	State	100% Grant	Additional Costs	Participant Reimbursements	Total E&T Costs	E&T Participants	Program Cost per Participant	Reimbursement Cost per Participant	Total Cost per Participant
Model 1: Job Search	Alabama	\$1,584,000		\$1,600,000	\$3,184,000	32,000	\$49.50	\$50.00	\$99.50
	Alaska	86,000	\$263,498	105,500	452,998	3,998	87.42	25.89	113.31
	California	5,013,000	2,544,693	3,992,800	11,550,493	164,243	46.02	24.31	70.33
	Iowa	652,000		919,080	1,571,080	29,773	21.90	30.87	52.77
	Kentucky (1)	1,517,170		2,109,700	3,626,870	35,064	43.27	60.17	103.44
	Missouri	1,188,000		1,000,000	2,188,000	21,037	56.47	47.54	104.01
	Nevada	105,000	223,278	19,169	347,447	8,000	41.03	2.40	43.43
	New Hampshire	74,000	547,863	45,000	666,863	900	690.96	50.00	740.96
	North Carolina (2)	1,390,000		3,343,280	4,733,280	25,004	55.59	133.71	189.30
	Oklahoma	814,000	214,760	1,033,350	2,062,110	20,667	49.78	50.00	99.78
	Texas	4,119,000	256,000	1,328,229	5,703,229	283,438	15.44	4.69	20.13
	West Virginia	850,000	205,974	520,000	1,575,974	26,850	39.33	19.37	58.70
	Virgin Islands (3)	91,000		6,840	97,840	687	132.46	9.96	142.42
	Subtotals	\$17,483,170	\$4,256,066	\$16,022,948	\$37,760,184	651,661	\$33.36	\$24.59	\$57.95
Model 2: Job Search Training	Arizona	\$598,000		\$280,000	\$878,000	\$5,600	\$106.79	\$50.00	\$156.79
	District of Columbia	211,000	\$426,068	2,000	639,068	2,745	232.08	0.73	232.81
	Georgia	1,587,000		314,700	1,901,700	21,336	74.38	14.75	89.13
	Idaho	180,000		67,900	247,900	3,960	45.45	17.15	62.60
	Louisiana	2,094,000		250,000	2,344,000	26,339	79.50	9.49	88.99
	Maryland	839,000		472,000	1,311,000	9,783	85.76	48.25	134.01
	Montana (4)	184,000	1,421,750	105,000	1,710,750	9,354	171.66	11.23	182.89
	Nebraska	307,000	28,000	222,000	557,000	13,035	25.70	17.03	42.73
	New Jersey	1,324,000		321,800	1,645,800	12,872	102.86	25.00	127.86
	New York	5,321,000		2,450,000	7,771,000	46,500	114.43	52.69	167.12
	North Dakota	110,000		90,000	200,000	5,212	21.11	17.27	38.38
	Oregon	699,000	2,316	327,272	1,028,588	25,857	27.12	12.66	39.78
	South Dakota	161,000	225,000	50,000	436,000	4,514	85.51	11.08	96.59
	Vermont	118,000	1,386,000	24,200	1,528,200	2,450	613.88	9.88	623.76
	Washington (5)	899,000		532,450	1,431,450	11,259	79.85	47.29	127.14
	Subtotals	\$14,632,000	\$3,489,134	\$5,509,332	\$23,630,456	200,816	\$90.24	\$27.43	\$117.67

Table 9 (cont.)

Program Model	State	100% Grant	Additional Costs	Participant Reimbursements	Total E&T Costs	E&T Participants	Program Cost per Participant	Reimbursement Cost per Participant	Total Cost per Participant
Model 3: Intensive Services	Arkansas	\$749,000	\$171,696	\$250,000	\$1,170,696	16,555	\$56.61	\$15.10	\$70.71
	Colorado	553,000	547,000	8,000	1,100,000	15,774	69.74	0.51	70.25
	Connecticut	404,000	141,750	50,000	595,750	1,148	475.39	43.55	518.94
	Delaware	100,000	376,150	52,500	528,650	1,688	282.08	31.10	313.18
	Florida	1,858,000	249,488	2,061,424	4,168,912	36,228	58.17	56.90	115.07
	Hawaii	285,000	323,067	150,000	758,067	3,500	173.73	42.86	216.59
	Illinois (6)	3,391,000	21,031,900	17,718,900	42,141,800	190,821	127.99	92.86	220.85
	Indiana	1,147,000	4,200,000	1,600,000	6,947,000	17,550	304.67	91.17	395.84
	Kansas	363,000	231,764	118,782	713,546	16,784	35.44	7.08	42.52
	Maine	343,000		100,000	443,000	3,740	91.71	26.74	118.45
	Massachusetts (7)	994,000	21,945,750	1,779,750	24,719,500	23,730	966.70	75.00	1041.70
	Michigan (8)	2,866,000	21,498,734	3,950,000	28,314,734	155,331	156.86	25.43	182.29
	Minnesota	703,000	1,598,000	2,392,000	4,693,000	29,730	77.40	80.46	157.86
	Mississippi (9)	1,516,000		332,450	1,848,450	16,048	94.47	20.72	115.19
	New Mexico	475,000		422,914	897,914	18,797	25.27	22.50	47.77
	Ohio	3,481,000	2,793,316	9,491,500	15,765,816	42,410	147.94	223.80	371.74
	Pennsylvania (10)	3,124,000	14,396,049	1,000,000	18,520,049	72,992	240.03	13.70	253.73
	Rhode Island	204,000		8,500	212,500	400	510.00	21.25	531.25
	South Carolina (11)	1,042,000		160,000	1,202,000	23,436	44.46	6.83	51.29
	Tennessee	1,562,000		200,000	1,762,000	32,696	47.77	6.12	53.89
	Utah	239,000	420,000	9,000	668,000	4,100	160.73	2.20	162.93
	Virginia	1,059,000		36,000	1,095,000	11,922	88.83	3.02	91.85
	Wisconsin (12)	1,138,000	1,471,590	561,756	3,171,346	31,941	81.70	17.59	99.29
	Wyoming	88,000	44,000	50,000	182,000	1,000	132.00	50.00	182.00
	Guam	53,000		42,500	95,500	850	62.35	50.00	112.35
	Subtotals	\$27,737,000	\$91,440,254	\$42,545,976	\$161,715,230	769,171	\$155.93	\$55.31	\$210.24
Totals, All Models		\$59,852,170	\$99,185,454	\$64,078,246	\$223,105,870	1,621,648	\$98.17	\$39.51	\$137.58

Table 9 (cont.)

Notes

- 1 The Federal allocation for Kentucky's 100% grant is more than stated in its Plan: \$1,656,000.
- 2 North Carolina: \$195,000 for Workfare.
- 3 Virgin Islands' Participant Reimbursement: Fed: \$3020; State: \$3820.
- 4 Montana's Participant Reimbursement: Fed: \$41,000; State: \$64,000.
- 5 The Federal allocation for Washington's 100% Grant is more than stated in its Plan: \$905,000.
- 6 Illinois: State is allocating \$2,572,000 for Adult Education. Participant Reimbursement: Fed: \$8,555,550; State: \$9,163,350.  
Illinois has not yet adjusted their 100% Grant and Additional Costs figures (as stated on this chart) to utilize the full 100% Grant allocation, but is expected to do so.
- 7 Massachusetts: State is allocating \$14,400,000 for Voucher Day Care.
- 8 Michigan's Participant Reimbursement: Fed: \$1,480,644; State: \$2,469,356.
- 9 Mississippi's Workfare Contractors will provide \$57,600 for Reimbursement expenses.
- 10 Pennsylvania's Additional Costs: Fed: \$5,087,466; State: \$9,308,583.
- 11 South Carolina: \$142,998 for Workfare.
- 12 Wisconsin's Total Cost includes \$90,200 for Workfare.

SOURCE: State E&T Program plans for FY1988. FNS Summary of E&T Program 1988 Budgets, December 1988. Data reflect initial State plans and not modifications made during the year.

**Table 10**  
**E&T Federal Program Budget versus Actual Expenditures, by State, FY1988**  
(In thousands of dollars)

State	Total Federal Budget	Total Federal Expenditures	Difference (Budget less Expenditures)	State	Total Federal Budget	Total Federal Expenditures	Difference (Budget less Expenditures)
Alabama	\$2,384	\$1,318	\$1,066	Nevada	\$226	\$210	\$16
Alaska	269	257	12	New Hampshire	370	279	91
Arizona	738	595	143	New Jersey	1,485	738	747
Arkansas	960	1,443	- 483	New Mexico	686	727	- 41
California	8,282	5,215	3,067	New York	6,546	4,741	1,805
Colorado	811	682	129	North Carolina	3,062	1,000	2,062
Connecticut	500	442	58	North Dakota	155	120	35
Delaware	314	314	0	Ohio	9,623	8,559	1,064
District of Columbia	425	375	50	Oklahoma	1,438	841	597
Florida	3,014	1,430	1,584	Oregon	864	776	88
Georgia	1,744	1,444	300	Pennsylvania	8,711	7,921	790
Hawaii	522	339	183	Rhode Island	208	138	70
Idaho	214	192	22	South Carolina	1,122	1,117	5
Illinois	22,463	13,566	8,897	South Dakota	299	252	47
Indiana	4,047	2,695	1,352	Tennessee	1,662	1,709	47
Iowa	1,112	953	159	Texas	4,911	4,628	283
Kansas	538	569	- 31	Utah	454	305	149
Kentucky	2,572	1,240	1,332	Vermont	823	551	272
Louisiana	2,219	1,848	371	Virginia	1,077	1,115	50
Maine	393	362	31	Washington	1,165	1,131	34
Maryland	1,075	581	494	West Virginia	1,213	1,051	162
Massachusetts	12,857	10,040	2,817	Wisconsin	2,155	1,981	174
Michigan	15,096	7,816	7,280	Wyoming	135	128	7
Minnesota	2,698	555	2,143	Guam	74	53	21
Mississippi	1,682	1,514	168	Virgin Islands	94	69	25
Missouri	1,688	1,645	43				
Montana	936	763	173	TOTALS	\$138,543	\$98,721	\$39,822
Nebraska	432	388	44				

SOURCE: FY1988 State E&T Program Plans. State FY1988 expenditure reports.

Table 11  
Changes in Planned E&T Program Participation, FY1988 vs. FY1989

State	Planned Number Participants FY1988	Planned Number Participants FY1989	Percent Change, FY88 to FY89	State	Planned Number Participants FY1988	Planned Number Participants FY1989	Percent Change, FY88 to FY89
Alabama	32,000	18,500	-42	Nebraska	13,035	4,900	-62
Alaska	3,998	2,445	-39	Nevada	8,000	1,628	-80
Arizona	5,680	5,900	5	New Hampshire	900	1,300	44
Arkansas	16,555	13,609	-18	New Jersey	12,872	7,439	-42
California	164,243	165,326	1	New Mexico	18,797	14,613	-22
Colorado	15,774	74,683	373	New York	46,500	52,101	12
Connecticut	1,148	661	-42	North Carolina	25,004	21,325	-15
Delaware	1,688	403	-76	North Dakota	5,212	3,014	-42
District of Columbia	2,745	2,070	-25	Ohio	42,410	62,827	48
Florida	36,228	71,400	97	Oklahoma	20,667	21,592	4
Georgia	21,336	9,783	-54	Oregon	25,857	27,411	6
Guam	1,680	875	-48	Pennsylvania	72,992	60,420	-17
Hawaii	3,500	2,961	-15	Rhode Island	400	310	-23
Idaho	3,960	4,172	5	South Carolina	23,436	12,430	-47
Illinois	190,821	133,171	-30	South Dakota	4,514	2,865	-37
Indiana	17,550	20,600	17	Tennessee	32,696	20,875	-36
Iowa	29,773	10,403	-65	Texas	283,438	108,581	-62
Kansas	16,784	5,780	-66	Utah	4,100	6,420	57
Kentucky	35,064	47,680	36	Vermont	2,450	2,300	-6
Louisiana	26,339	30,621	16	Virginia	11,922	64,207	439
Maine	3,740	4,826	29	Washington	11,259	13,800	23
Maryland	9,783	6,370	-35	West Virginia	26,850	15,828	-41
Massachusetts	23,730	16,500	-30	Wisconsin	31,941	38,564	21
Michigan	155,331	76,405	-51	Wyoming	1,000	2,100	110
Minnesota	29,730	28,460	-4	Virgin Islands	687	524	-24
Mississippi	16,048	17,571	9	NATIONAL TOTAL:	1,620,798	1,372,733	-15
Missouri	21,037	21,602	3				
Montana	9,354	9,582	2				

SOURCE: FY1988 and FY1989 State E&T Program Plans.

Table 12  
**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF E&T PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS  
 AT APPLICATION/RECERTIFICATION  
 BY PROGRAM MODEL  
 FY1988**

E&T PARTICIPANTS					ALL WORK REGISTRANTS (%)
TOTAL (%)	Model 1: Job Search (%)	Model 2: Job Search Training (%)	Model 3: Intensive Services (%)		
AGE					
16-18	4.6	4.9	1.9	7.7	5.0
19-21	8.4	11.4	3.5	12.3	11.6
22-30	31.7	28.6	32.3	33.4	26.2
31-40	28.2	29.2	28.1	27.6	27.3
41-50	15.4	16.2	17.2	12.5	17.3
51-60	11.6	9.5	17.0	6.3	12.3
Over 60	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2
Missing	-	-	-	-	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
MEAN (Years)	32.6	33.5	35.8	31.4	34.7
GENDER					
Male	50.4	57.1	43.2	54.5	53.0
Female	49.6	42.9	56.8	45.5	46.7
Missing	-	-	-	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
MARITAL STATUS					
Married	17.0	31.5	19.2	17.4	36.4
Divorced					
Widowed or Separated	30.3	30.3	35.1	28.5	} 63.6
Never Married	52.7	38.2	45.7	54.1	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ETHNICITY					
White, Non-Hispanic	39.3	60.9	27.0	40.0	53.0
Black, Non-Hispanic	52.7	28.1	63.7	55.5	30.2
Hispanic	7.2	10.3	8.5	3.5	8.5
American Indian Alaskan Native	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.5	2.1
Asian, Pacific Islander	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.5	1.1
Missing	-	-	-	-	5.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources: E&T participant characteristics derived from Baseline Interview Forms; information on all work registrants is derived from 1986 Integrated Quality Control System Data.

Table 13

**HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS OF E&T PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS  
AT APPLICATION/RECERTIFICATION  
BY PROGRAM MODEL  
FY1988**

	E&T PARTICIPANTS				ALL WORK REGISTRANTS (%)
	TOTAL (%)	Model 1: Job Search (%)	Model 2: Job Search Training (%)	Model 3: Intensive Services (%)	
HOUSEHOLD SIZE					
1	54.1	43.4	63.4	50.0	25.5
2	21.4	21.6	24.0	18.2	21.3
3	9.1	12.8	4.5	12.2	17.4
4	7.5	11.2	3.8	9.4	15.2
5 or more	7.9	11.0	4.3	10.2	20.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION					
Single person household	54.1	43.4	63.4	50.0	25.5
Two married adults	9.7	11.4	13.0	4.4	7.1
Two married adults and at least one child	11.4	20.5	6.3	11.4	27.5
Single female with at least one child	9.1	6.0	8.7	11.7	18.8
Other	17.4	18.7	8.6	22.5	21.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NUMBER OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS					
1	84.1	72.3	92.3	82.0	82.0
2	13.4	23.4	6.6	15.0	15.3
3 or more	2.5	4.3	1.1	3.0	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTAL GROSS INCOME FOR PAST 12 MONTHS					
Under \$3,000	64.5	62.6	63.0	65.6	47.7
3,001 to 6,000	16.9	19.2	14.5	18.4	27.1
6,001 to 9,000	11.3	9.2	14.9	8.2	13.5
9,001 to 12,000	3.6	4.3	3.0	4.0	7.4
12,001 to 15,000	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.8	2.2
Over 15,000	2.1	2.6	1.9	2.0	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources: E&T participant characteristics derived from Baseline Interview Forms; information on all work registrants is derived from 1986 Integrated Quality Control System Data.

Table 13: (Continued)

	E&T PARTICIPANTS				ALL WORK REGISTRANTS
	TOTAL	Model 1: Job Search	Model 2: Job Search Training	Model 3: Intensive Services	
PRIOR MONTH: SOURCES OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Earnings					
%*	19.1	31.7	12.3	18.8	31.7
Mean**	\$479.59	\$494.60	\$519.96	\$438.31	\$438.81
AFDC					
%	6.2	5.9	2.0	11.4	16.5
Mean	\$308.72	\$225.94	\$232.69	\$357.69	\$301.06
General Assistance					
%	40.8	1.6	62.2	41.1	14.8
Mean	\$128.83	\$348.39	\$105.54	\$170.60	\$231.17
Unemployment Insurance					
%	1.9	2.8	1.5	1.6	3.8
Mean	\$416.32	\$485.39	\$380.37	\$385.84	\$394.45
Social Security/Pensions					
%	7.8	5.2	12.4	4.0	9.8
Mean	\$464.51	\$437.81	\$488.83	\$393.68	\$374.25
Public Housing					
%	1.9	3.6	1	2.1	
Mean	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Housing Assistance					
%	1.5	2.4	1.1	1.4	
Mean	\$163.33	\$135.29	\$195.41	\$164.19	N/A
Medicaid					
%	6.1	4.4	1	13.4	29.0
Mean	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Child Support					
%	2.7	3.5	1.5	3.8	2.3
Mean	\$197.22	\$205.50	\$192.17	\$194.55	\$99.28
Average Total Income	\$286.69	\$323.77	\$260.07	\$296.74	\$425.25

\* Percent of households having the particular source of income.

\*\* Averages computed for those households receiving income from the particular source.

Table 14  
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND LABOR MARKET EXPERIENCE  
OF E&T PARTICIPANTS  
AT APPLICATION/RECERTIFICATION  
BY PROGRAM MODEL  
FY1988

	E&T PARTICIPANTS				ALL WORK REGISTRANTS (%)
	TOTAL (%)	Model 1: Job Search (%)	Model 2: Job Search Training (%)	Model 3: Intensive Services (%)	
<b>EDUCATION</b>					
Less than grade 12	54.0	52.8	58.1	49.8	17.3
High School grad/GED	36.5	37.3	34.4	38.6	12.2
Some college	8.1	8.6	6.4	9.8	1.7
College graduate	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.8	0.6
Missing	-	-	-	-	68.2
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<b>HAD VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL TRAINING (OTHER THAN HIGH SCHOOL)</b>	34.1	25.8	44.9	23.0	N/A
<b>PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCE</b>					
Never worked	17.5	15.2	9.2	29.8	
Did not work during last 12 months	39.7	32.3	57.6	21.7	
Worked during last 12 months	42.8	52.5	33.2	48.5	
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	N/A
<b>IF WORKED IN LAST 12 MONTHS, LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT</b>					
4 weeks or less	13.2	12.7	8.4	17.9	
5-12 weeks	18.9	21.3	15.6	19.9	
13-24 weeks	21.1	28.8	18.0	20.3	
25-36 weeks	12.9	13.6	11.6	13.5	
37 weeks or more	33.9	26.6	46.4	28.4	
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	N/A
<b>MEAN WEEKS</b>	25.5	23.3	31.5	21.6	

Table 14: (Continued)

	E&T PARTICIPANTS				ALL WORK REGISTRANTS
	TOTAL (%)	Model 1: Job Search (%)	Model 2: Job Search Training (%)	Model 3: Intensive Services (%)	
<b>CURRENT LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION</b>					
Worked last week	10.9	11.6	12.6	8.5	
Did not work, but had a job	1.3	2.0	0.6	1.6	
Did not work, but looked for work in last 4 weeks	42.7	53.3	43.3	34.7	
Did not work, and did not look for work in last 4 weeks	45.1	31.1	43.5	55.2	
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	N/A
<b>FOR THOSE WHO WORKED LAST WEEK, NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED</b>					
8 hours or less	14.6	22.4	9.0	17.4	
9-16 hours	48.4	25.7	76.1	19.1	
17-24 hours	15.4	24.6	4.7	26.0	
25-32 hours	12.0	17.7	5.3	18.9	
33-40 hours	7.8	7.8	4.2	14.5	
Over 40 hours	1.9	1.8	0.6	4.2	
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	N/A
<b>MEAN hours/week</b>	18.2	18.4	16.2	21.7	
<b>FOR CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, USUAL HOURS PER WEEK</b>					
8 hours or less	4.4	7.6	2.3	4.2	
9-16 hours	13.8	10.2	20.1	8.5	
17-24 hours	21.5	12.6	33.5	13.1	
25-32 hours	10.8	12.5	6.5	15.4	
33-40 hours	42.0	49.2	31.5	49.8	
Over 40 hours	7.5	7.8	6.2	9.1	
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	N/A
<b>MEAN hours/week</b>	30.3	31.7	27.5	32.9	
<b>Average Gross Hourly Wage</b>	\$5.59	\$5.22	\$5.33	\$6.25	N/A

Sources: E&T participant characteristics derived from Baseline Interview Forms; information on all work registrants is derived from 1996 Integrated Quality Control System data.